NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

MBA PROFESSIONAL REPORT

Power and Leader Effectiveness in Organizations: A Literature Review

---

By: **Michael M. Barksdale**
September 2008

Advisors: **Cynthia L. King**
Lisa L. Massi Lindsey

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.			
1. AGENCY USE ONLY ***(Leave blank)***	**2. REPORT DATE** September 2008	**3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED** MBA Professional Report	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Power and Leader Effectiveness In Organizations: A Literature Review		**5. FUNDING NUMBERS**	
6. AUTHOR(S) Michael M. Barksdale			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000		**8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER**	
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A		**10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER**	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.			
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited		**12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE**	

13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words)

This study examines the effects of power, interpersonal attraction, and perceived similarity on employee and organizational outcomes. The purpose of this paper is twofold: The first purpose is to review the communication and organizational literature on power in order to illustrate how various uses and forms of power impact employee perceptions of leaders. Scholars from various disciplines have accepted the definition of power as "the capacity to produce intended effects, and in particular, the ability to influence the behavior of another person" (Burgoon and Dunbar, 2005, p. 208). This definition of power can be extended to describe a leader's power in the workplace, as leaders are often characterized by their capacity to make effective decisions and their ability to influence their employees' actions and perceptions. The results of this research on power might aid military leaders in better understanding how their communicative behaviors impact their subordinates. The second purpose of this paper is to review the literature on interpersonal attraction and investigate its impact on employee outcomes. Interpersonal attraction in a relationship is most often described as the attitude(s) that one person has toward another person. The nature of interpersonal attraction in relationships has been associated with individual mental health and physical well-being (Orbuch and Sprecher, 2003), and perceived similarity is a factor that often explains why interpersonal attraction occurs in the workplace (Morry, 2007). The results of this research on interpersonal attraction and perceived similarity might aid military leaders in further understanding how interpersonal attraction in relationships might impact organizational outcomes.

14. SUBJECT TERMS Power, Leadership, Leadership Communication, Interpersonal Attraction, Perceived Similarity			**15. NUMBER OF PAGES** 83
			16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	**18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE** Unclassified	**19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT** Unclassified	**20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT** UU

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

POWER AND LEADER EFFECTIVENESS IN ORGANIZATIONS: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Michael Barksdale, Lieutenant, United States Navy

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
September 2008

Authors: _____
Michael M. Barksdale

Approved by: _____
Professor Cynthia L. King, Lead Advisor

_____
Professor Lisa L. Massi Lindsey, Support Advisor

_____
Robert N. Beck, Dean
Graduate School of Business and Public Policy

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

This study examines the effects of power, interpersonal attraction, and perceived similarity on employee and organizational outcomes. The purpose of this paper is twofold: The first purpose is to review the communication and organizational literature on power in order to illustrate how various uses and forms of power impact employee perceptions of leaders. Scholars from various disciplines have accepted the definition of power as "the capacity to produce intended effects, and in particular, the ability to influence the behavior of another person" (Burgoon and Dunbar, 2005, p. 208). This definition of power can be extended to describe a leader's power in the workplace, as leaders are often characterized by their capacity to make effective decisions and their ability to influence their employees' actions and perceptions. The results of this research on power might aid military leaders in better understanding how their communicative behaviors impact their subordinates. The second purpose of this paper is to review the literature on interpersonal attraction and investigate its impact on employee outcomes. Interpersonal attraction in a relationship is most often described as the attitude(s) that one person has toward another person. The nature of interpersonal attraction in relationships has been associated with individual mental health and physical well-being (Orbuch and Sprecher, 2003), and perceived similarity is a factor that often explains why interpersonal attraction occurs in the workplace (Morry, 2007). The results of this research on interpersonal attraction and perceived similarity might aid military leaders in further understanding how interpersonal attraction in relationships might impact organizational outcomes.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

LT Michael Barksdale, United States Navy, is a student in the Master of Business Administration program (with an emphasis on Material Logistics Support) at the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California. LT Barksdale completed his undergraduate studies at Norfolk State University in Norfolk, Virginia with a BS in Management Information Systems. LT Barksdale has served as the First Lieutenant on USS FORD (FFG 54), as the Assistant Plans Officer to Commander, Destroyer Squadron Fifteen and as the Liaison Officer to Commander, Naval Region Southwest Asia. His next assignment is to be the First Lieutenant on USS Harpers Ferry (LSD-49) in Sasebo, Japan.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank all my professors and staff members (Captain Kathryn Hobbs, Commander Philip Gonda, and Claire Fess) who supported me during my 20 months at NPS. I especially thank my thesis advisors, Professor Cynthia L. King and Professor Lisa L. Massi Lindsey, for all for their support, guidance, and encouragement during this MBA project. I thank the Dudley Knox Library staff for their research assistance. I thank Commander Vincent Quidachay and Lieutenant Commander Kenneth Ehresman for encouraging me to attend the Naval Postgraduate School. Most importantly, I thank my family for the support and love they provided during my time in Monterey. Lastly, I thank God for the blessings, love, support, guidance, and encouragement that he continues to provide in my life. I hope my efforts provide new perspectives on leadership effectiveness in the U.S. Navy.

Michael M. Barksdale

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LE FT BLANK

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study examines the effects of power, interpersonal attraction, and perceived similarity on employee and organizational outcomes. One purpose of the study was to review the communication and organizational literature on power and employee perceptions of leadership in order to illustrate how various uses and forms of power impact employee perceptions of leaders and leadership communication. The literature seems to support the notion that power and leadership communication share an association and that communication transactions reveal subsequent effectiveness of communication between the leader and the employee. These findings are important for two reasons: First, it may be important to the leader to understand how and why his five power bases contribute to positive and negative employee perceptions of leadership. Second, the leader should be aware that employee perceptions have associations with employee outcomes in the workplace—such as self-esteem, commitment, and job satisfaction, among others—that may influence organizational outcomes, such as productivity.

The second purpose of the study was to review the literature on interpersonal attraction and perceived similarity to investigate their impact on employee outcomes. Attractions are the basis on which individuals decide to enter relationships, which, in the workplace, are often formal and involuntary. The literature seems to support the notion that interpersonal attraction and perceived similarity share an association. Perceived similarity is a factor that often explains why interpersonal attraction occurs in the workplace, and it may impact employee outcomes. These findings are important for three reasons: First, it is beneficial for leaders to understand how attraction occurs in the workplace because they are expected to ensure positive workplace relationships (manager-to-employee, manager-to-manager, and employee-to-manager) in the organization. Second, leaders should understand how they may increase employees' attraction towards them. Increased attraction will cause the employee to like the leader more, which will then increase the attraction between the two. Third, these findings shed light on how an objective criterion (performance) and a subjective criterion (perceived

similarity) sometimes become indistinguishable as evaluation criteria that managers use to make decisions—decisions that impact employee outcomes. These findings may aid military leaders in better understanding how their communication behaviors impact their subordinates and how interpersonal attraction in relationships might impact organizational outcomes.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. RESEARCH PROBLEM DEVELOPMENT

In business, the prevailing perspective is that organizational success is the result of two well-known variables: management and leadership. Both are considered independent, cooperative variables necessary to achieve successful organizational outcomes. There are two accepted beliefs that distinguish management and leadership. Management is the process of creating organizational opportunities that increase revenues, reduce process inefficiencies, and maximize returns on investment (ROI) (Nutt and Backoff, 1993). Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of individuals within the organization to achieve these organizational opportunities (Hersey, Blanchard & Natemeyer, 1979; Nutt and Backoff, 1993). By and large, management is approached from an organizational perspective, while leadership may be approached from both an organizational and an interpersonal perspective. There are numerous studies of leadership in the private sector. Most of these studies emphasize that leaders must foster positive relations with their employees if leadership is to be effective in influencing their activities. Studies support the accepted belief that a leader must communicate effectively to reap positive employee outcomes. Leadership and its impact on organizational outcomes are of deep interest and concern to the U.S. Navy. Much of the literature, however, examines leadership in the private sector. Additional studies, which consider the relationship between leader effectiveness and various communication behavioral characteristics, also are based on private-sector research. Although this literature is valuable and can offer many insights that are relevant to Navy leaders, leadership research conducted by Department of the Navy personnel may provide deeper insights since the superior/subordinate and peer-to-peer relationships in the U.S. Navy are distinct from public sector relationships.

While many of my contemporaries appeared to be interested in management methodologies to improve ROI, I was more interested to how leadership influences *the activities of employees* to improve ROI. With this in mind, my research focuses on the

interpersonal interactions between a leader and subordinates. More specifically, I wanted to discover how leaders use their power to influence subordinates to get things done. To refine this even further, I was interested in how leaders *communicate* their power and how their subordinates perceive it. This, then, led to the question of whether it is the leader's power alone that influences subordinates, or whether it is the manner in which the leader *communicates* power that influences employees to get things done. The next area of inquiry concerned how a leader's use of power affects employees' perceptions of leadership. In the arena of perceptions, interpersonal attraction in relationships comes to mind: How do superior/subordinate and peer-to-peer relationships develop, and, specifically, what causes the interpersonal attraction in these relationships? I wanted to know what perceptions about others lead to interpersonal attraction; for example, do apparent similarities between people cause mutual attraction? In turn, would these similarities have an impact on the polarity and strength of superior/subordinate and peer-to-peer relationships?

Hence, the overall objective of this research was to conduct a summary and synthesis of literature pertaining to Power, Interpersonal Attraction, and Perceived Similarity in the private sector. A further objective was to explore the importance of this research for leaders in the U.S. Navy. For this purpose, I analyzed these communicative concepts and their influence on employee and organizational outcomes to provide new perspectives on leadership effectiveness in the U.S. Navy.

B. RESEARCH PROBLEM IMPORTANCE

This research is important and valuable because it can offer insights that are relevant to Navy leaders, for numerous reasons. First, this study discusses the role and uses of power, which may provide Navy leaders with insights on how power, if used effectively, can help them cultivate an organizational culture that enhances employee performance, motivation, and satisfaction. Second, the discussion of leadership communication may provide command leadership with a better understanding of how communication behavior affects employee outcomes and, thus, organizational outcomes. This may also enable leaders to potentially be more effective in improving employee

retention, increasing command readiness, and managing organizational change. Third, the exploration of interpersonal attraction may provide Navy leaders with ideas for improving their superior/subordinate and peer-to-peer relationships. In summary, this research offers new perspectives on the power that leaders possess and how superior/subordinate and peer-to-peer similarities affect interpersonal attractions in the workplace.

C. RESEARCH PROBLEM IN THE EXISTING LITERATURE

The overall objective of this research was to conduct a summary and synthesis of literature pertaining to Power, Interpersonal Attraction, and Perceived Similarity, and to explore the importance of this research for leaders in the U.S. Navy. To conduct this summary and synthesis, I examined peer-reviewed social science literature in the areas of communication, management, leadership, organizational management, human resource management, sociolinguistics, psychology, and sociology.

The literature on power was reviewed to investigate how the private sector views power. The review revealed that scholars from various disciplines have distinct perspectives on what power is. The differences appear to arise from the different environments in which the researchers studied power; however, all referenced French and Raven (1959) for their development of the five bases of social power theory. The literature revealed that there are five power bases: legitimate, reward, expert, referent and coercive (French and Raven, 1959). The literature also revealed that there are three forms of power: manifest, latent, and invisible (Komter, 1989). Some leading scholars studied power in the family, while others studied power in the workplace. Leading scholars such as Rollins and Bahr (1976), Dunbar (2004), and Dunbar and Burgoon (2005), for example, restricted their scope of study to power in marital relationships. Their conclusions are applicable to relationships such as friendships, familial relationships, and dating relationships. They emphasized power from a relational perspective and emphasized that power can be understood through observing the communication behaviors that occur in relationships. Other scholars, such as Tjosvold (1989), Katz (1998), and Gioia and Sims (1983), approached power using a relational perspective and

examined the interactions and communication behaviors in the manager-employee relationship. Their studies were reinforced by the work of Hirokawa, Kodama, and Harper (1990), who suggest that communication is a medium that is used to transmit and gain power in the workplace and that a leader's ability to persuade is associated with his or her communication (written and verbal) ability.

On the topics of interpersonal attraction and perceived similarity, the reviewed literature illustrated how various uses and forms of power impact employee perceptions of leaders. The review revealed that scholars from various disciplines have distinct perspectives on interpersonal attraction and perceived similarity, as well. Similar to power, some leading scholars studied the interpersonal attraction that exists in the family setting, and others studied interpersonal attraction in the work place; however, all referenced Byrne (1971) for his initial study on interpersonal attraction, which paved the way for studies to follow. The study of interpersonal attraction outside and within the workplace varied little and, thus, most of the studies provided similar conclusions. However, leading scholars Huston and Levinger (1978) suggest that interpersonal attraction in relationships outside the workplace is often informal and voluntary, while in relationships in the workplace, it is often formal and involuntary. In summary, Klohnen and Luo (2003) and Orbuch and Sprecher suggest that interpersonal attraction is the basis on which individuals decide to enter relationships such as friendships, romantic relationships, and marriages. Baker (1983) developed a formal friendship model that suggests that the following process occurs in Interpersonal Attraction: 1) If the interpersonal attraction is mutual and receptive, a positive attitude will foster mutual liking, loving, and respect (Backman, 1981); 2) the positive attitude will reinforce positive interpersonal attraction, which will create a reciprocated attraction; and 3) interpersonal attraction strengthens as the friendship formation process matures through further interactions.

D. RESEARCH PROBLEM METHODOLOGY FOR TOPIC DISCUSSION

First, I conducted some background readings on rhetorical thinking to develop insight on how to build a persuasive argument. Second, to gain insight into my research

discussion topics, I conducted an online database search of the scholarly, peer-reviewed literature offered by the Dudley Knox Library. The library has an extensive online database that offers access to journals held in the CSA, EBSCO, and ProQuest databases and, if needed, outside access to databases such as WorldCat. I initially narrowed my search to peer-reviewed journals from the communication, management, leadership, and organizational management disciplines. However, I later found that peer-reviewed journals from these disciplines would not provide the depth of insight needed to fully grasp the discussion topics. I quickly found that the discussion topics required an interdisciplinary study that was evaluated from many perspectives and in many social settings. Therefore, I widened my scope to include journals in additional social science disciplines such as: human resource management, sociolinguistics, psychology, and sociology.

E. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The topics of this research study were: Power, Interpersonal Attraction, and Perceived Similarity. The discussion topics were developed into four research questions that emphasized relationships between the three topics and their association with employee outcomes. The aim was to provide insights for continued research in these areas. The research questions were as follows:

1. What is the relationship between power and employee perceptions of leadership communication?
2. What is the relationship between Power and employee performance/motivation/satisfaction?
3. What is the relationship between employees' interpersonal attraction to superiors and employee performance/motivation/satisfaction?
4. What is the relationship between employees' perceived similarity to their superiors and employee performance/motivation/satisfaction?

F. STRUCTURE OF STUDY

This remainder of thesis is organized into three main sections. The first section explores power: different perspectives on power; power bases; forms of power; the relationship among power, leadership, and communication; and power and employee

outcomes. The second section examines interpersonal attraction: different perspectives on interpersonal attraction; characteristics of interpersonal attraction; the relationship between interpersonal attraction and perceived similarity; and the relationship between interpersonal attraction and employee outcomes. Finally, the conclusion provides key points on power and interpersonal attraction, implications for leaders' communication, research limitations, and suggestions for future research.

II. POWER

A. INTRODUCTION

Burgoon and Dunbar (2005) compare power as a fundamental concept of social science to energy's role in the study of physics. Scholars from various disciplines have accepted the definition of power as "the capacity to produce intended effects, and in particular, the ability to influence the behavior of another person" (Burgoon and Dunbar, p. 208). This definition of power can be extended to describe a leader's power in the workplace, as leaders are often characterized by their capacity to make effective decisions and their ability to influence their employees' actions and perceptions. The purpose of this paper is to review the communication and organizational literature on power and to illustrate how various uses and forms of power impact employee perceptions of leaders. The result of this research might aid military leaders in better understanding how their communicative behaviors impact their subordinates.

B. PERSPECTIVES OF POWER

This literature review suggests that power can be evaluated from many perspectives and social contexts. These social contexts begin on an individual level and progress to dyadic, organizational, and societal levels. The sections below describe how power influences dyadic relationships in the family unit and suggest that power has similar influences in the workplace.

1. Power within Dyadic Relationships

The word power is derived from the Latin word "posse," which means "to be able" (Dunbar, 2004, p. 236). In their study of power in dyadic relationships, Dunbar and Burgoon (2005) support the concept that power is the "capacity to produce intended effects, and in particular, the ability to influence the behavior of another person" (p. 208). An earlier study by Dunbar suggests that power is also the ability to "control the behavior of another person" (p. 238).

The research on power in dyadic relationships aims to determine "how the partners relate to each other and how decisions are made" (p. 235). The family unit is an exceptional model for study because of the diversity of personalities, hierarchal structures, and interdependencies that are involved in familial interaction. Within the family unit, resources are often pooled to achieve goals (Dunbar, 2004). Dunbar describes these pooled resources as "anything that one partner makes available to the other, helping the latter satisfy needs or attain goals," resulting in interdependencies that ultimately create power within the family structure (p. 239). For example, the American family (out of need) often pools household incomes to support common physiological needs such as food, water, gas and electricity. Interdependencies of this nature may be social norms in many family units, and minors are often included as a way of encouraging personal growth and development.

A well-regarded theory used by scholars to gain perspective on power in the family unit is Dyadic Power Theory (DPT) (Dunbar, 2004). DPT asserts that power is an integral part of any relationship, especially close relationships, because it determines how partners relate to each other and how decisions are made. Within these relationships, power is a perception "of one's own capacity relative to an interaction partner, not an absolute" (p. 238). The interaction between partners in a relationship is ever-changing. The nature of the interactions may be cooperative, communicative, and the commitment level may be high when situations are positive. Consequently, if the nature of the relationship between interactive partners changes, so may the partners' perception of their capacity. The interactive nature of relationships, therefore, makes power within relationships a conditional and dynamic perception of capacity.

Rollins and Bahr (1976), Dunbar (2004), and Dunbar and Burgoon (2005) have used DPT to evaluate power from a relational perspective and have emphasized that power can be understood through observing the communication behaviors that occur in relationships. Several communication behaviors and cognitive perceptions that occur in relationships can be easily confused with power because they share similar outcomes, but they are not power. Here are a few related behaviors that occur in dyadic relations that are often confused as power:

a. Control Attempts

Control attempts are "[a]ttempts by one person to change the behavior of another" (Dunbar, p. 238). Control attempts are active behaviors that are manifested in relationships, whereas power may be latent and invisible. This distinction will be discussed in further detail in the next section. Examples of control attempts are dominance, stonewalling, withdrawal, and non-negotiation. (p. 238).

b. Counter-control Attempts

Counter-control attempts are "responses to control attempts from an individual's interaction partner" (pp. 238-239). Counter-control attempts are active resistive responses to another's manifested behaviors and cannot exist without the action of another. Power is not a response and can exist with inaction.

c. Control

This occurs when "when actual compliance follows a control attempt" (p. 239). Power can exist when there are no behavioral attempts at control.

d. Interpersonal Dominance

Power is perceived; dominance is enacted (Dunbar and Burgoon, 2005). "Dominance is one behavioral manifestation of the relational construct of power" (p. 209) and, although related, it is not synonymous with power. Power is the capacity and ability to influence, but not the behavior itself. While it may not be apparent where the power in a relationship lies, it is more than apparent who is exhibiting dominant behaviors.

e. Authority

Authority "[r]efers to norms regarding who 'ought to' control different situations in a relationship. These are culturally accepted norms, based partially on status, to which both interaction partners adhere" (p. 239). Authority begets power and the

converse is true, as well. However, possessing power does not grant an individual the authority to exercise power. Hence, authority and power are dependent on each other. In various cultures, still today, it is not customary for women to have authority over household finances, even though they may possess the "expert power" in financial matters to do so. Expert power will be discussed in further detail in the next section.

Though Dunbar (2004) and Dunbar and Burgoon (2005) restricted their scope of study to power in marital relationships, their conclusions are applicable to relationships such as friendships, familial relationships, and dating relationships. In addition, they suggest that their conclusions also apply to "other settings where interactants have an established history, are dependent on one another for outcomes, and expect to have continued interaction in the future" (Dunbar, p. 243). Perhaps the workplace could be viewed as one of these other settings described by Dunbar (2004). Given what we know from Dunbar (2004) and Dunbar and Burgoon (2005) about power in dyadic relationships, workplace relationships are worthy of study because they, too, embody complex interdependent interactions. Power is likely just as important in the workplace and may be even more so due to the number of partners relating to each other to determine how decisions are made (Dunbar, 2004).

2. Power within the Workplace

The workplace certainly seems to fit the criterion of being a setting in which interactants have a working relationship and are interdependent in achieving present and future outcomes. Power in the workplace is certainly important because individuals often require influence to accomplish their goals. Both the perspectives on power in the workplace and the approaches to its study vary. The literature suggests that one can view power from the perspective of a system or structure, of the individual, and of the dyadic relationship.

First, one may take the perspective that power exists in the workplace due to the organization's system or structure and that it exists as a mechanism to influence and control behavior. From this perspective, one may approach power as the capacity to

"mobilize people and resources to get things done" (Katz, 1998, p. 420). With this approach, it is plausible that one could examine the perceived capacity of power against its actual effect on employees' productivity.

Second, Lawrence and Robinson (2007) take the perspective that "organizational power reflects actions of any individual or organizational system that controls the behavior or beliefs of an organizational member" (p. 389). This is a more complete perspective because it recognizes not only the organization's power, but also the importance of individual power. The view that power is an ability that can "get others to do what they would not otherwise do despite their resistance" could apply to organizational and individual power, as well (Tjosvold, 1989, p. 50). It is plausible that one could use this perspective to study the ability of an organization and individual(s) to counter employee resistance during common workplace situations such as union disputes, takeovers, and downsizing. Moreover, these perspectives on organizational power imply that power is the capacity or ability to influence organizational outcomes. This perspective may be especially well suited to developing solutions to deter unacceptable organizational behavior.

Lastly, Dunbar (2004) and Dunbar and Burgoon's (2005) DPT study support a plausible perspective that power exists in the workplace because the workplace is essentially a multitude of dyadic relationships. These relationships consist of manager-to-employee, manager-to-manager, and employee-to-employee interactions. Relationships in the workplace affect one's power to mobilize employees and resources to get things done (Tjosvold, 1989; Gioia and Sims, 1983). An approach using a relational perspective could examine the interactions and communication behaviors in the manager-employee relationship. Katz (1998) and Hirokawa, Kodama, and Harper (1990) did just that by conducting studies of communication exchange in the manager-employee relationship. Both Hirokawa et al., (1990) and Katz (1998) suggest that communication is a medium that is used to transmit and gain power in the workplace. Both studies revealed insightful comparisons and contrasts of different managers' persuasive communication ability to effect subordinate compliance. Additionally, these studies indicate that managers do vary in the extent of their power. Katz (1998) suggested that managers can increase their

power through skillful written and verbal communication with others. By simply knowing what to say, when to say it, and how to say it, managers can increase their power and create the perception of expertise. Katz (1998) referred to this skill as expert power, one of the five bases of social power described by French and Raven (1959).

C. POWER BASES

There are various sources or bases of power in the workplace. Power bases refer to individuals' resources that constitute the foundation to control other individuals (Dunbar, 2004). Power in the workplace can be derived from control of sought-after resources, from relationships fostered with other powerful people, and from the formal hierarchy structure, among others (Katz, 1998). Power in the workplace is an important concept to managers because they must mobilize employees and resources to get things done. It is also important for managers to be aware of the relationship between the use of power and subordinate satisfaction and organizational commitment (Mossholder, Bennet, Kemery, & Wessolowski, 1998). To be an effective manger, one must be aware of his base(s) of power, select the appropriate base(s) of power given the situation, and engage in an appropriate strategy to use the power base(s) (Hirokawa et al., 1990). French and Raven (1959) identified five types of social power that scholars in various fields continue to use (Gioia & Sims, 1983): legitimate, reward, expert, referent, and coercive. It is important to note that some scholars have identified *Informational Power* and *Credibility* as additional bases of power. Rahim (1989), along with several other scholars, mention that *Informational Power* and *Credibility* are part of the social power framework initially conceptualized by French and Raven (1959). The five bases of power are described below:

1. Legitimate Power

Legitimate Power is based on the manager's position in the organization and is validated by the members of the organization (Gioia & Sims, p. 10). The formal organizational structure provides the framework to enact legitimate power because it defines the rights and responsibilities within the organization, and it establishes the

hierarchy. In the U.S. military, legitimate power is hierarchal and is distinguished by uniform insignia and collar devices. In the public sector, those who wield legitimate power may be less distinguishable to someone unfamiliar with an organization's structure.

2. Reward Power

Reward Power is based on the manager's ability to control and administer rewards (such as money, praise, or promotions) to his subordinates (Gioia & Sims, p. 9). The ribbons and medals that decorate the uniforms of U.S. service members are an illustrative example of how formal reward power is used to recognize and praise exemplary performance. Rewards may also be informal and non-verbal, and in this case, they exist as a perception of the employee (Rahim, 1989). For example, an employee may perceive his manager's respect, autonomy, and personal approval (Mossholder et al., 1998) as a result of exemplary performance. Although merely perceived, these rewards may receive equal employee appreciation.

3. Expert Power

Expert Power is based upon the manager's knowledge, expertise, skills, or abilities concerning his job (Gioia and Sims, p. 10). Expert power is apt to be accomplished through reasoning and empowerment activities (Mossholder et al., 1998). Expert power is independent of hierarchal position and job title, and it is considered a source of *personal power* within the workplace (Katz, 1998). Members with expert power are often referred to as the "chosen one," "golden boy," "go-to guy," or member of the "A-team." For example, in the realm of politics, Karl Rove is commonly referred to by his peers as the "architect" due to his expertise in political strategy. A more common example is the "employee of the month," who is selected for his diligence, attitude, and expertise.

4. Referent Power

Referent Power is based upon others' desire to emulate the manager (Gioia & Sims, p. 10). Managers with referent power likely have an ability or quality that subordinates identify with (Mossholder et al., 1998). For example, if a manager is admired and respected (for numerous reasons), his subordinates may emulate his characteristics in order to gain the same admiration and respect. The term "Be Like Mike" is an example of the referent power Michael Jordan wielded as an NBA superstar. There are positive relationships between referent and expert power (Fedor, Davis, Maslyn & Mathieson, 2001), in part because they both can lead to admiration and emulation. One may infer that these positive relationships suggest that referent power is independent of hierarchal position and job title, as well. This independence is evident in the selection of the employee of the month, who is chosen for his work ethic and job performance, regardless of his job title or the level within the organization.

5. Coercive Power

Coercive Power is based on the ability of the manager to control and administer punishment (such as pay cuts, verbal reprimands, or demotions) to his subordinates (Gioia and Sims, p. 9). Coercive power is used when employee actions are incongruent with workplace policies, codes, and procedures and with organizational expectations. Coercive power in the military is often portrayed in cinema and television as dramatic, memorable verbal reprimands for poor performance or an unaccomplished mission. However, coercive power does not have to be harsh; performance evaluations that highlight employee shortfalls to improve their productivity and capture their full potential are positive, while still showing an assertion of power.

In summary, managers "derive their coercive, reward, and legitimate power bases from the positions they hold, but they derive their expert and referent power bases from their own training, experience and personal qualities" (Rahim, Kim, & Kim, 1994, p. 137). Hence, this is the reason that several scholars classify expert and referent power as personal power bases and the others as position power bases. In addition to the five power bases, leaders might draw upon three forms of power in organizations.

D. FORMS OF POWER

French and Raven's (1959) analysis provides insight on how power is derived and its ability to influence others. Komter (1989) extends their analysis and describes the behavioral and cognitive context of power. He describes power as existing in three forms: manifested, latent, and invisible (Dunbar, 2004). Komter provides additional depth and suggests that power is also an ability that exists in relationships as both a conscious and a subconscious perception. Manifest, latent, and invisible power, described below, provide insight on how power is seen, perceived and felt.

1. Manifest Power

Manifest power is the "action" power, one that requires exertion to be noticed or visible. Manifest power surfaces in visible outcomes such as attempts at change, conflicts, and strategies (Komter, 1989). Some examples of workplace interactions in which manifest power is visible occur during decision making, problem solving, and conflict management (Dunbar, 2004). These workplace interactions may require the manifestation of one's power to achieve one's desired objectives (Dunbar, 2004). For example, a leader's power is visible when he or she administers rewards and punishments to employees, especially publicly, in the workplace. A leader's power is also visible when he demonstrates his workplace expertise.

2. Latent Power

Latent power, the "inaction" power, is not overtly expressed (p. 236). Often, latent power is operating when the needs and wishes of the more powerful person are anticipated and met, or the less powerful person refrains from conflict when negative results are feared (p. 236). Manifest power may foster the conditions that permit latent power to exist and be effective. For example, a leader who has a consistent track record of administering stern but fair reprimands for policy infractions may be anticipated to do so if future infractions occur. Hence, if a leader has developed a reputation for being a person of principles and sternness, employees may be less inclined to commit policy infractions due to the anticipated reprimand. Another example is the reserved head chair

for the highest-ranking manager (the CEO or an Admiral, for example) during boardroom meetings; it goes without saying that the head chair is reserved for the CEO due to his position in the organization and respect for his leadership.

3. Invisible Power

Invisible power is the "unconscious subtle" power that is not seen or felt. It is a mental predisposition toward awareness, perception, reasoning, intuition, and judgment caused by cultural norms and expectations (Komter, 1989). Invisible power has been defined as the result of social or physiological mechanisms that do not necessarily surface in overt behavior or in latent grievances (p. 192). The effects of invisible power generally escape the awareness of the people involved (p. 192), unlike latent power, which is noticeable and visible, although not overtly expressed (Dunbar, 2004). What further distinguishes invisible power is that latent power and manifest power are expressed and, therefore, can be controlled. For example, the workplace is an environment that should not accept gender bias; however, it is an unspoken expectation that men should conduct themselves as gentlemen and be chivalrous. Chivalry is influenced by cultural norms and expectations that underscore social and physiological gender differences. A chivalrous act such as "letting the lady go first" positions the male as "the helper or supporter" and is a subtle gesture that unconsciously says we are different. Another example is the politically incorrect "small talk" in the workplace that may exclude those who are sensitive to the subject matter. Such "small talk" may, then, exclude some employees from workplace social interaction because it reinforces differences. In these cases, being chivalrous and "politically" insensitive are subtle ways of reinforcing gender differences.

There are many perspectives on power, and this section has reviewed the literature on the five power bases (legitimate, reward, expert, referent and coercive), as well as three forms of power (manifest, latent, and invisible). With this background in the existing literature on power, we can now explore its association with perceptions of leadership communication.

E. POWER, LEADERSHIP AND COMMUNICATION

This section will determine if the literature suggests that a relationship exists between power and perceptions of leadership communication. We know that a leader uses power to influence employees and organizational outcomes. We also know that power exists in relationships as both a conscious and subconscious perception (Komter, 1989). Within these relationships, which are influenced by power, the leader and the employees form perceptions of one another through behavior and communication interactions. How a leader communicates his or her power may influence the perception of his leadership communication. In order to explore the connection between power and perceptions of leadership communication, two key terms must first be defined: leadership and leadership communication.

1. Leadership

Power has been defined as the ability to influence others (French and Raven, 1959). Leadership has typically been defined as the process of influencing *the activities* of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal accomplishment (Hersey, Blanchard & Natemeyer, 1979, p. 418). Hence, leadership may be perceived as the process in which a leader uses power to influence others. Or, more simply, leadership is a leader's power in motion. Given that a leader must utilize power to influence others (p. 419), and given that leadership is evaluated on how well the leader influences others to achieve desired outcomes, there may be an interdependent relationship between power and leadership. When referring to any of history's great leaders, their leadership is almost inseparable from the various power bases they possessed. For example, Mother Theresa and Mahatma Gandhi were great leaders because, through their referent power, they were able to influence people to help the poor and less fortunate and pursue change through non-violence. Without their referent power, they could not have been regarded as great leaders.

Leadership is important because "leaders are expected to influence their employees to be energetic and skillful in the pursuit of organizational objectives" (Tjosvold, Andrews & Struthers, 1992, p. 39). Leadership is the Olympic torch that leads

others in pursuit of the Olympic gold of organizational success. Leadership is considered an essential component of powerful organizational cultures (Bohn, 2002, p. 65). Examples of organizations with powerful organizational cultures include the United States military, Greek Fraternities and Sororities, and religious organizations, among others. U.S. military leadership persistently explores innovative strategies that will improve leaders' ability to persuade, convince and control subordinates more effectively (Tjosvold et al., 1992). Why? Because powerful leaders are expected to be effective influencers who can effect desired mission outcomes.

Leadership, like power, involves a hierarchical component — a leader-follower relationship (Eriksen, 2001, p. 23). In this relationship, power is ability, and leadership is the process of utilizing this ability. Given this, leadership may also be perceived as a process of interpersonal leadership (Eriksen, 2001). The process of interpersonal leadership requires a cooperative relationship between leaders and employees. The quality and strength of this cooperative relationship determine how well leaders can wield power and underlie the overall success of his leadership. For example, the leader-employee performance appraisal process may be more collaborative and may have a greater positive impact if a well-established leader-subordinate cooperative relationship exists.

In some cases, the company's executive officer is so high in the hierarchical structure that he or she cannot directly affect the subordinates. In this case, leadership may be perceived as organizational leadership. Research has demonstrated that organizational leaders spend most of their time in brief, informal interactions or conversations (Barge, Downs & Johnson, 1989, p. 362). The process of organizational leadership must, therefore, be transmitted to subordinates organization-wide through mid- and low-level leader interactions. Organizational leadership is important because it correlates strongly with organizational confidence and collaboration between members of the organization (Bohn, 2002). An example of organizational leadership is the impact that the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) has on each and every sailor across the rank

structure. Although the CNO is often an intangible leader in the eyes of many sailors, his policies and correspondence reach and affect each sailor, with the goal of improving morale and organizational cooperation and efficiency.

In summary, leadership is a process in which a leader uses power. Leadership is an influence process that is both interpersonal and organizational, which requires leader-subordinate cooperation in order to be successful. Given this integral relationship between leadership and power, leaders must assess not only their behavior, but also their possession and use of power, in order to understand how they influence people (Hersey et al., p. 418). In addition, the way that a leader influences people is through communication.

2. Leadership and Communication

There are three ways to observe leaders in order to define, qualify, and characterize their leadership: 1) a behavioral approach; 2) an attributional approach; and 3) a communication approach (Penley and Hawkins, 1985). The leader reveals that the communication approach may be the best approach to define leadership. Communication is a two-way process that involves transactional speaking and listening (Baldoni, 2004; Penley and Hawkins, 1985). Thus, to observe leadership from a communication approach, one must observe the speaking and listening transactions between the leader and employees. The communication transactions between leaders and subordinates can be observed for content and relational rapport characteristics (Penley and Hawkins, 1985). Communication content corresponds to "what is being said," while communication relational rapport characteristics correspond to "how it is said." These two aspects of communication, together, reveal the nature of cooperation within the relationship (Penley and Hawkins, 1985), which may, in turn, reveal the strength of the leader's influence within the relationship.

For several reasons, communication is the most valued leadership skill in organizations (Campbell, White & Johnson, 2003). First, leadership communication is the medium to facilitate organizational goal attainment, such as performance, job satisfaction that may be necessary to assimilate in the organizational culture (Greenbaum,

Holden, & Spataro, 1983). Second, leadership communication is critical factor in work motivation and the grooming of committed employees (Mayfield and Mayfield, 2002). Third, leadership communication "is the bridge that transmits behavioral intent to employees, thus creating the foundation of trust" (p. 90). This foundation of trust fosters the conditions to build cooperative leader-employee relationships, which are positively associated with retention and organizational loyalty.

A leader may demonstrate his leadership communication during various interpersonal interactions with employees, including 1) performance appraisals, 2) coaching seminars, 3) information-sharing workshops, and 4) award ceremonies. During these interpersonal interactions and forums, a leader's power is manifested and visible to employees. Regardless of the interaction or forum, the success of leadership communication is revealed by subsequent employee behaviors. A leader's communication has been successful when he has met four objectives to influence subsequent employee behaviors. The leader has 1) informed employees of the issues and how the issues relate to them; 2) solicited employees' input; 3) ignited employees with passion and imagination; and 4) invited employees to participate in accomplishing mission objectives (Baldoni, 2004). Successful leadership communication is a perception of both the leader (transmitter of communication) and the employee (receiver of communication). The perceptions of leadership communication are a crucial component of this two-way transaction and may reveal the leader's effectiveness (from the employees' perspective) in influencing subordinates' subsequent behaviors to achieve organizational outcomes.

3. Power and Leadership Communication

While management (as a process) may be based solely on power derived from the organization's formal hierarchy, leadership (as a process) is based on power within the interpersonal relationship between leaders and subordinates (Barge et al., 1989). Within this interpersonal relationship, the leader's communication approach will reveal the characteristics (type and magnitude) of the power bases he possesses. Perceptions of leadership are shaped by two factors: the leader's communication approach and the

power bases he uses to influence the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal accomplishment (Barge et al., 1989). Bass (1985) contends that two types of leaders exist (p. 359).

The first type of leader is the described as the transactional leader (Barge et al., 1989). Transactional leaders influence and motivate primarily through rewards and punishments to gain compliance, strongly relying on the reward and coercive power bases derived from their formal managerial position within the organization (Barge et al., 1989). As a result, transactional leadership requires the leader to hold a formal managerial position to ensure that leadership communication is successful and effective. Here are two examples that illustrate the manner in which a transactional leader might communication with his employee: 1) "Mike, ensure that you meet this quarter's sales objectives, or your next performance evaluation may be blemished." 2) "Mike, your bonus this year will reflect next quarter's target sales, so ensure that you achieve these targets." In both of these examples, the leader's attempt to motivate employee compliance is less likely to be less successful if he does not communicate from a formal managerial position.

The second type of leader is the described as the transformational leader (Barge et al., 1989). Transformational leaders do not rely on their reward and coercive power bases but, rather, on their referent and expert power (Barge et al., 1989). Transformational leadership is independent of formal managerial positions; therefore, anyone within the organization can be a transformational leader. Transformational leadership emphasizes the necessity for leaders to possess sufficient language and rhetorical skills to create compelling visions for their followers (p. 360). Transformational Leadership then shifts from simply giving directions, rewards, or punishments to providing "explanations, rationalizations, and legitimation for the activities undertaken in the organization" (Pfeffer, 1981, p. 4). Here are two examples that illustrate the manner in which a transformational leader might communication with his or her employee: 1) "Mike, achieving this quarter's sales objectives will definitely improve your next performance evaluation, and this will benefit your career immensely." 2) "Mike, next quarter's sales can positively influence your bonus this year, so do your

best to get your well deserved yearly bonus." In both of these examples, which are meant to motivate employee compliance, the success of the communication does not depend on the speaker holding a formal managerial position. Thus, the communication may be successful and effective, regardless of whether the communicator is a leader or a subordinate.

4. Perceptions of Leadership Communication

As previously stated, employee (receiver of communication) perceptions of leadership communication are a crucial component of this two-way transaction. The manner in which the leader transmits communication will determine the success of his leadership. The leader must overcome several employee barriers to communication. First, employees have expectations in the form of stereotypes and prototypes that may bias what is actually seen and heard during the communication exchange (Bradac and Street, 1989). Second, the employee sometimes perceives messages that are not actually present in the message (Bradac and Street, 1989). Third, employees' perceptions of leadership behavior may embellish communication inaccuracies and inconsistencies that are not in the actual message (Bradac and Street, 1989). Preconceived perceptions of the leader and leadership communication do impact employee perceptions in follow-on interactions. For example, "it was observed that when listeners thought a speaker had a 'dominant' personality, the speaker's voice was perceived to be 'louder' than when the same voice was believed to have come from a speaker without a dominant personality" (p. 220). In addition, it has been observed that "in some situations where a given communicator is believed to have abundant and uncontested power, virtually anything this person says will seem powerful" (p. 215). In both cases, the speaker may have previously manifested his power, which may have fostered enduring positive employee perceptions for all subsequent interpersonal communication. Both cases suggest that it may be necessary for a leader to manifest his power bases to establish a positive reputation of overall leadership effectiveness and competence. Incidentally, this reputation could set the pre-conditions for all other successful leadership attempts. A leader who is highly regarded may encounter less employee bias when communicating.

Thus, it may be important to establish, early on, an enduring reputation that will precede all other leadership attempts. To do so, it may be best to concentrate on referent and expert power bases because they are personal power bases and, as such, are less associated with the formal hierarchical structure.

Having examined power, leadership, and leadership communication, a discussion of the relationship between power and employee outcomes is warranted. The next section explores the relationships between power and several employee outcomes in the workplace.

F. POWER AND EMPLOYEE OUTCOMES

One of the most popular and most influential frameworks for studying the effects of perceived supervisor influence on subordinates' work attitudes and behaviors has been French and Raven's (1959) classification of five distinct bases of social power (i.e., reward, coercive, legitimate, expert, and referent) (Elangovan and Xie, 1999, p. 359). Research has studied the relationship between the leader's five power bases and employee attitudes and behaviors, such as self-esteem, commitment, and job satisfaction (Elangovan and Xie, 1999). It may be important, especially for managers, to understand this relationship because their leadership spearheads organizational outcomes, and the success of organizational outcomes is one criterion to evaluate the effectiveness of their leadership. It may also be important to understand how leaders' five power bases impact employees' perceptions of the leadership in the workplace.

1. Power and Self-Esteem

Self-esteem is an individual resource for coping with environmental conditions (Elangovan and Xie, 1999) in the workplace and is often explored to understand its relationship with employee performance (Fedor et al., 2001). Self-esteem is described as an individual resource for coping because employees "exposed to the same environmental conditions might exhibit remarkably different psychological, physical, and behavioral reactions" (Elangovan and Xie, p. 360). Leaders generally desire to inspire employees and build their self-esteem in hopes of improving employee performance and

overall organizational productivity. Given this, it would be beneficial for a leader to understand how he can use his power bases to improve the workplace environment and, thus, have a positive effect on employees' self-esteem (Elangovan and Xie, 1999).

Research has shown that a leader's bases of social power can impact employee self-esteem. Adler (1983), Elangovan and Xie (1999), and Fedor et al., (2001) studied employees by moderating variables such as motivation, stress, and work effort to observe the strength of their relationships when interacting with the five distinct bases of social power. They concluded that employees have conditional low and high degrees of self-esteem when interacting with varying strengths of the five bases. Elangovan and Xie (1999) specifically concludes that the strength of the leader's bases of social power impacts self-esteem, which then proceeds to impact motivation, stress, and work effort. Research evidence shows that "for individuals with low self-esteem, supervisor power was very strongly and positively related to subordinate internal motivation and work effort, while this relationship was weak for those with high self-esteem" (p. 366). Research evidence [also] shows that individuals with low self-esteem rely more on leaders and other employees, while their high-self-esteem counterparts rely more on their ability and skills (p. 361). This evidence has practical application. If a leader has a firm understanding of his power bases, he can apply power strategies effectively to improve employee self-esteem.

2. Power and Commitment

Studies define commitment as a process within an organization and as a relationship with an organization. Kanter (1968) suggests that, as a process within an organization, commitment is a "process through which individual interests become attached to the carrying out of socially organized patterns of behavior which are seen as fulfilling those interests, as expressing the nature and needs of the person" (p. 500). Moreover, it is a process that binds the individuals into social systems, essentially functioning as the social glue (Kanter, 1968). In terms of a relationship with an organization, Rahim and Afza (1993) suggest that commitment is "an active relationship with the organization such that individuals are willing to give something of themselves in

order to contribute to the organization's well being" (p. 613). Organizational commitment is important because it is linked to an estimated 11-percent boost in employee productivity and about 34 percent of employee turnover (Mayfield and Mayfield, 2002). In general, commitment may be perceived as a process in which individuals develop an active binding relationship with an organization or social system. For example, think of the entry boot camp process that U.S. Marines undergo, the output of which is a full-fledged lifetime U.S. Marine. There is a clear process and relationship that maintains lifetime commitment. To a leader, commitment is important because it helps integrate employees into the organization, establish organizational cohesiveness, and influence organizational behavior (Kanter, 1968).

A leader's bases of social power can impact commitment in the organization. Rahim and Afza (1993), in their study of commitment in the organization, reach three important conclusions. First, they conclude that commitment shares a positive relationship with work satisfaction, which varies as it interacts with the five distinct bases of social power. Second, they conclude that expert and referent power have the strongest positive impact on commitment in the organization, with coercive power having the strongest negative impact. Lastly, they conclude that commitment and job satisfaction are positively associated with the propensity to leave a job. These conclusions suggest that leaders will benefit from developing a greater understanding of commitment, which ultimately affects employee turnover.

3. Power and Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is an effective reaction to a job that results from the incumbent's comparisons of actual outcomes with desired outcomes (Robie, Ryan, Schmieder, Parra, & Smith, 1998, p. 470). More simply put, job satisfaction may be regarded as "the persistent feelings a person has towards his or her work" (Rahim and Afza, 1993). If the adage "a happy worker is a productive worker" holds true, then it is in the organization's best interest to ensure that these persistent feelings are positive. Therefore, it also is in the organization's best interest to ensure that its leaders use their bases of social power to effect a positive job climate that creates "happy, productive workers."

A leader's bases of social power can impact job satisfaction in the organization. Rahim and Afza (1993), Rahim et al., (1994), and Robie et al., (1998) studied job satisfaction and concluded that expert and referent power bases have a positive relationship with job satisfaction and that the coercive power base has a negative relationship with job satisfaction. Thus, one may conclude that as a leader strengthens his expert and referent power, he can effect greater job satisfaction amongst employees. Job satisfaction shares a relationship with several moderating variables. First, commitment and job satisfaction are positively associated with the propensity to leave a job (Rahim and Afza, 1993). Second, there is a relationship between job satisfaction and job level (Robie et al., 1998). There is some scholarly debate over whether this relationship is positive or negative, with some scholars claiming that job satisfaction decreases as job level increases (Robie et al., 1998). Nevertheless, job satisfaction shares a relationship with commitment, job level and the propensity to leave a job. These conclusions suggest that the leader should develop a greater understanding of how job satisfaction impacts employee productivity, which ultimately affects employee turn-over.

G. CONCLUSION

A review of the communication and management literature on power and employee perceptions of leadership was conducted to illustrate how various uses of and forms of the five power bases power impact employee perceptions of leaders and leadership communication. An examination of leaders' five power bases power from an interpersonal approach provides a more insightful understanding of power in the workplace. The interpersonal approach allows examination of power in complex workplace relationships (manager-to-employee, manager-to-manager, and employee-to-employee) in a variety of interactions. In addition, the literature seems to support the notion that power and leadership communication share an association. This association can be explored by observing the communication transactions between the leader and the employee. These communication transactions have message content and relational rapport characteristics that may reveal subsequent effectiveness of leadership communication between the leader and the employee. These findings are important for

numerous reasons. First, it may be important to the leader to understand how and why his five power bases contribute to positive and negative employee perceptions of leadership. Second, the leader should be aware that employee perceptions have associations with employee outcomes in the workplace—such as self-esteem, commitment, and job satisfaction, among others—which may influence organizational outcomes such as productivity. Lastly, these findings may aid military leaders in better understanding how their communicative behaviors impact their subordinates.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

III. INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION

A. INTRODUCTION

Interpersonal attraction in a relationship is most often described as the attitude(s) that one person has toward another person. Attitudes may be observed through the feelings, beliefs, and behaviors one person expresses about and towards another (Orbuch and Sprecher, 2003). The attitudes in relationships—whether a personal relationship such as marriage or a professional relationship such as employer/employee—produce interpersonal attractions that may either be positive or negative (Orbuch and Sprecher, 2003). The nature of interpersonal attraction in relationships has been associated with individual mental health and physical well-being (Orbuch and Sprecher, 2003) and perceived similarity is a factor that often explains why interpersonal attraction occurs in the workplace (Morry, 2007). For this reason, the study of interpersonal attraction is important and warrants understanding because it may affect employee outcomes. The purpose of this chapter is to review literature on interpersonal attraction and investigate the impact on employee outcomes. The result of this research might aid military leaders in further understanding how interpersonal attraction in relationships with might impact organizational outcomes.

B. PERSPECTIVES OF INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION

Researchers study attractions because they impact the manner in which individuals think, behave, and communicate within their relationships, both in and out of the workplace. Researchers also study attractions because attractions are the basis on which individuals decide to enter relationships such as friendships, romantic relationships, and marriages (Klohnen and Luo, 2003; Orbuch and Sprecher, 2003). The study of attraction began out of the desire to understand relationships outside the workplace; however, once researchers gained further insight, they realized that attractions in the workplace were equally important. As a result, researchers extended their study to

the workplace to understand how attraction affects interpersonal relationships within it. The sections below discuss interpersonal attraction both inside and outside the workplace.

1. Interpersonal Attraction outside the Workplace

Interpersonal attraction in relationships outside the workplace is often informal and voluntary (Huston and Levinger, 1978). Attraction is often characterized as the attitude toward another, and this attitude is comprised of feelings, cognition (beliefs), and behaviors (Orbuch and Sprecher, p. 340). Interpersonal attraction is often considered the catalyst for forming relationships such as friendships, romantic relationships and marriages. For this interpersonal attraction to occur, individuals must interact and then be aware that they share an attraction. If the interpersonal attraction is mutual and receptive, a positive attitude will foster mutual liking, loving, and respect (Backman, 1981). Positive attitudes will reinforce positive interpersonal attraction, which will create a reciprocated attraction. This is known as the process of friendship formation (Baker, 1983). Interpersonal attraction strengthens as the friendship formation process matures through further interactions. Baker (1983) describes the process of friendship formation as a positive feedback loop, which is essentially an exchange of positive attitudes that will increase interactions and interpersonal attraction (Backman and Secord, 1959; Baker, 1983).

Consider a romantic relationship to illustrate the process of friendship formation. First of all, friendship formation begins when "we meet people, like some of them, and gradually become friends with a few individuals" (Baker, p. 269). Normally, these individuals will meet under informal and voluntary circumstances. If when individuals meet, they exchange mutually positive attitudes, then a positive feedback loop is formed. When a positive feedback loop is formed, the number of their interactions will increase. This, in turn, will increase the strength of the interpersonal attraction. Subsequently, the strength of the interpersonal attraction will increase the number of interactions in which to exchange mutually positive attitudes. Ultimately, the interpersonal attraction becomes so great that a romantic relationship develops. Inevitably, as the friendship formation process matures in a romantic relationship, marriage becomes a possibility.

Attraction in interpersonal relationships is revealed in the feelings, behaviors, and beliefs shared by the individuals. Feelings, behaviors, and beliefs provide insight into the nature of the relationship and may reveal the polarity and strength of the attraction (Huston and Levinger, 1978). The polarity and strength of a relationship may be strongly positive or strongly negative. Huston and Levinger (1978) illustrate how the nature of attraction between individuals is revealed through their feelings, behaviors, and beliefs. In their study, they decoded this statement that a male college student test subject made about his girlfriend: " . . . I adore her. When I'm with her, I look at her constantly. . . . We are united together" (p. 115). The researchers broke down and decoded this statement as follows. First, "I adore her" revealed favorable attitudes of affection, respect, liking and love, demonstrating the strength and polarity of his feelings (p. 115). Second, "I look at her constantly" revealed a behavior—an affectionate action—illustrating the strength and polarity of behaviors (p. 115). Third, "We are united together" revealed a sense of joint belonging, which is a perception of mutual unity and illustrates the strength and polarity of his beliefs (p. 115). In short, this is interesting because the study substantiates what we already know. Words and behaviors are observable manifestations of our true feelings. Depending on the degree of one's emotional intelligence—say, the leader in the workplace, for example—one may apply these invaluable insights on the nature of interpersonal relationships in the workplace.

2. Interpersonal Attraction and the Workplace

Interpersonal attraction in relationships in the workplace are often formal and involuntary (Huston and Levinger, 1978). Attraction in the workplace is often characterized as "how much one likes the other person and the degree to which one would enjoy working with that person" (Bryne, 1997, p. 421). Generally speaking, attraction in the workplace is "the positive attitude of liking another person" (Feren, Carroll, and Olian, 1988, p. 33). McCroskey and McCain (1972) states that attraction concerns judgments about whether one person likes the other or feels good while in the presence of another.

Relationships in the workplace are usually ‘working friendships.’ These friendships may develop into other forms of interpersonal relationships; however, organizations generally have fraternization policies that prohibit other forms of interpersonal relationships. In particular, large companies such as fortune 500 companies and government organizations maintain fraternization policies that prevent ‘non-working friendships’ from developing. Typically, the more hierarchical the organization is, the more polices are instituted to regulate interpersonal attraction.

Relationships in the workplace are shaped by the organization’s structure and policies. Organizational structure and policies often, in some cases, serve as the sole catalyst for interpersonal attractions to develop. This makes interpersonal attraction in the workplace distinct from interpersonal attraction outside the workplace. For example, an organizational crisis will cause attractions to develop that would not occur under normal work conditions. Organizational crises will form interpersonal attractions out of need of organizational survival but, as soon as the crisis ends, the attractions formed may end. Another example that makes interpersonal attraction in the workplace distinct is the inability to end a relationship when negative attitudes develop which causes the attraction to end, essentially forming an interpersonal repulsion. Even when negative attitudes form and the attraction ends, individuals must often continue the “working friendship.’ In many cases, the only way to end this ‘working friendship’ is to voluntary separate from the organization.

Although the catalyst for friendship formation may be different, attraction in the workplace shares the same friendship development process as relationships outside the workplace. That is, both kinds of relationships begin with interactions that create mutual awareness of attraction. The interpersonal interaction(s), if positive, then creates a positive feedback loop. The positive feedback loop then increases the interpersonal interaction, which, thus, increases the strength of the interpersonal attraction. In the workplace, the increasing strength of interpersonal attractions will continue as a loop of positive feedback that will create stronger workplace relations (leader-to-employee, leader-to-leader, and employee-to-employee). As such, individuals in workplace relationships must be able to convey perceived likability to increase the interpersonal

attraction within their relationships. Or, perhaps, they must be able to hide their dislikability to avoid creating a negative interaction or a negative feedback loop.

There are several ways leaders can increase likability and maintain a positive feedback loop. Feren et al., (1988) suggests that leaders can increase their likeability through their display of competence. Likeability will then increase the attraction of employees towards them. Backman and Secord (1959) and Baker (1983) suggest that simply conveying the perception of liking another will cause one to be liked, which will then increase attraction between the two. Hence, if leaders show that they like their employees, their employees will like them. In essence, the leader can manipulate attraction in their relationships.

My research on interpersonal relationships in the workplace leads me to believe that harmonious relationships will benefit the organization. First, Cote (1999) suggests that "in general, happier employees are more productive, and also that more productive employees are happier" (p. 68). Second, Pfeffer (2005) indicates studies, which suggest "that the most productive employees were about twice as good as the least productive" (p. 97). Consider an example: In the movie "Gung Ho," a character played by Michael Keaton improved American automotive plant efficiency by improving working relations between the Japanese management and American laborers. The character's efforts improved mutual attitudes, which increased mutual likability. This, in turn, increased the interpersonal attraction between the Japanese management and the American laborers. The relational benefits translated into happier employees that were more productive and increased work output.

Happier, more productive employees are many of the advantageous incentives for organizations to emulate the 'Gung Ho' organization in the movie. The goal of every organization is, in a sense, to be a 'Gung Ho' organization. A 'Gung Ho' organization will, more often than not, display interpersonal attractions in workplace that are positive and strong. Positive and strong interpersonal attractions in the workplace may be seen essentially as a measure of organizational cohesiveness. With this background on

interpersonal relationships, we can now explore the characteristics of interpersonal attraction, which may provide indicators as to whether a relationship is positive and strong.

C. CHARACTERISTICS OF INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION

The most powerful determinant of interpersonal attraction is an indication that one is liked; if these feelings are reciprocated, a close friendship is likely to develop (Sharma and Kaur, 1996, p. 635). Some key questions to ask include: What exactly are the indicators that one is liked in an interpersonal relationship? Do these indicators reveal how well one is liked? These questions arise because it is human nature to want to know if one is liked and, if so, how much. The answers to these questions about may validate people's perceptions of their interpersonal relationships.

Generally speaking, leaders and employees want to know if our co-workers like working with them and the extent to which they are liked as a co-worker (Feren et al., 1988). The sections below explore behavioral and communication characteristics that may reveal the context (polarity and strength) of interpersonal attraction in relationships. These characteristics, though subjective, may provide a simple rule-of-thumb heuristic to evaluate interpersonal relationships.

1. Behavioral Characteristics

There are several behavioral characteristics that may reveal the context of interpersonal attraction in relationships. Behavioral characteristics provide indication of how well individuals like each other and the attraction in the interpersonal relationship. Specifically, the behavioral characteristics of physical time spent with another, social distance, eye contact, and seating distance are examined here because they are commonly identified and, thus, easily seen in the day-to-day work environment.

a. Amount of Physical Time

One indication of how well individuals like each other and the attraction in the interpersonal relationship is the *amount of physical time* individuals spend with each

other (Baker, 1983). One way to measure the amount of physical time is simply to count the number of times one physically interacts with another during the course of the workday. It is important to note that the amount of physical time individuals spend may not be voluntary. However, beyond the possible involuntary nature of the interaction, if these formal interactions are numerous, pleasant, and cooperative, then this may suggest that the interpersonal relationship is positive and strong. The converse may also true; that is, if co-workers do not spend much time together, that may indicate that individuals are not as attracted to one another.

b. Social Distance

A second indication how well individuals like each other and the attraction in the interpersonal relationship is the *social distance* during their interpersonal interactions (McCroskey and McCain, 1972). Social distance is the degree to which individuals are willing to admit other individuals into their social circle (McCroskey and McCain, 1972), which in essence is a group of individuals who are socially interconnected. For an example of a social circle, consider employees that are faithful golfers, who first thing Monday morning gets together to, discuss their weekend par scores. Those employees that do not golf generally exclude themselves from these social circle discussions because they have nothing to add to the golf discussion. Hence, social circles may increase the social distance between employees. Essentially, social distance may be perceived as the social bridge that needs to be crossed for attraction to occur. It is not surprising that the larger the social distance between individuals, the smaller the chance that an individual will be allowed into another's sphere or circle. If this occurs, an attraction cannot develop, and no interpersonal relationship will be formed. For instance, recall Ronald Reagan's 1987 nomination of Robert Bork, a political conservative, for the position of United States Supreme Court Justice. The confirmation process was one of the most memorable nomination debates due to Robert Bork's legal position on civil and women's rights and his advocacy of increased executive powers. Consequently, his political conservatism widened the social distance between himself and the Democratic-led Congress, which, resulted in a confirmation denial. Had Robert Bork changed his

stance on some issues and closed that social distance, he might be a member of the United States Supreme Court today. In summary, social distance is influenced heavily by shared feelings, beliefs, and behaviors.

c. Eye Contact

A third indication of how well individuals like each other and the attraction in the interpersonal relationship is *eye contact* during interpersonal interactions (McCroskey and McCain, 1972). Eye contact is a form of non-verbal communication that can arouse inner emotions, such as love, sadness, anger, trust, and pity. The old adages that 'the eyes are the windows to one's soul' and that 'the eyes reveal the hidden truth of ones true intentions' underscore the importance of eye contact in interpersonal interactions. It is a common belief that an individual who maintains eye contact when communicating has trustworthy character and just intentions. A study found "the frequency of [eye] glances to positively correlate with an individual's liking for another" (p. 3). An additional study found that "pupil size and eye dilation has also been proposed as a measure of interpersonal attraction" (p. 3). Consider this for example: "both males and females respond more positively to targets who maintain eye contact with them, and they prefer opposite-sex individuals with dilated pupils to those with nondilated pupils" (Byrne and Griffitt, 1973, p. 322). In other words, eye contact helps to create a positive interpersonal interaction, which may then increase the attraction between individuals.

d. Seating Distance

A fourth indication how well individuals like each other and the attraction in the interpersonal relationship is *seating distance* during interpersonal interactions (McCroskey and McCain, 1972). A study found that individuals "generally stand slightly closer to those we like than to those we do not like" (p. 3). In American culture, seating distance often conveys depth of familiarity, comfort level, and interpersonal attraction. Seating distance is, in a sense, pre-programmed behavior in response to our attraction and mutual likeability. The seating distance we choose may result from numerous reasons, including social distance. To an observer, seating distance may be the simplest and most

obvious indication of attraction. For instance, seating distance of individuals during their office lunch break may reveal who likes whom, how well they are liked, as well as who is not well liked. In summary, as McCroskey and McCain (1972) point out, the closer individuals sit to one another, the more likely it is that they have a mutual interpersonal attraction.

2. Communication Characteristics

Communication characteristics may reveal the context of interpersonal attraction in relationships. Communication characteristics provide indication of how well individuals like each other and the attraction in the interpersonal relationship. Two characteristics are of particular importance: the amount of verbal communication and the degree of openness in communication. These two characteristics are important because they are commonly identified and, thus, easily seen in the day-to-day work environment.

a. Amount of Verbal Communication

One indication of how well individuals like each other and the attraction in the interpersonal relationship is the *amount of verbal communication* that occurs among individuals (Baker, 1983). One way to measure the amount of verbal communication is simply to record the amount of time individuals spend in dialogue with one another during the course of the workday. However, not all the verbal communication between individuals may be voluntary. Nonetheless, if these formal verbal communications are numerous, pleasant, and cooperative, then this may suggest that the interpersonal relationship is positive and strong. The converse may also true.

b. Open Communication

A second indication how well individuals like each other and the attraction in the interpersonal relationship is the degree of openness in communication that occurs among individuals (Montgomery, 1986). Open communication is defined as “the process by which personal information is inferred from verbal and nonverbal behavior” (p. 140). In other words, open communication is the process of disclosure in which individuals

may also reveal hidden truths about the attraction in their interpersonal relationship. Hence, the degree of openness in communication may be considered the type of disclosure in the relationship, which allows individuals to infer more about the other. In addition, the degree of openness in communication may allow individuals to grow closer which may then increase the interpersonal attraction in the relationship. In short, open communication is vital to the health of the organizational climate and one of the communication characteristics that leads to a 'Gung Ho' work environment.

The open communication process is similar to the friendship formation process described earlier. That is to say, the degree of openness in communication may increase as the friendship formation process matures. Moreover, as the strength of interpersonal attraction increases, so may the type of disclosure in the relationship, which allows individuals to infer more about the other. Hence, the attraction in the interpersonal relationship will strengthen. Research models on interpersonal relationships suggest that "liking begets disclosure and disclosure begets liking" (p. 141). The more one person "sends" observable open behaviors, the more the other reciprocates the attraction (p. 144). In other words, the more one likes another person the more he or she will communicate with that person and increase the degree of disclosure. This, then, leads to increased attraction. The result is a positive feedback loop of disclosure that leads to mutual likeability and further open communication.

Most importantly, for open communication to exist, individuals need to believe or expect that their communication will be warmly accepted during their interaction (McAllister, 1983). Researchers study openness in communication by observing the words, actions, gestures and facial expressions that occur during everyday interpersonal interactions (Montgomery, 1986). Researchers have two criteria of observation to measure openness in communication: message content and message style. Message content is 'what is said,' and message style is 'how it is said' (Montgomery, 1986). Both are equally important for opening the lines of communication. For example, Martin Luther King was a great leader and orator because he was able to influence social change by connecting with those of his time with great speeches delivered with charismatic message style and content. The message content was effective because it had

sustenance that addressed relevant social issues (Thomas and Thomas, 2004). The message style was effective because it contained melodious rhetoric, metaphors, and similes that his audience could relate to (Thomas and Thomas, 2004). As illustrated in the example, both message style and content are used to persuade and win the trust of others. For example, McAllister (1983) notes that the success of programs in the workplace depends upon the superior-subordinate relationship and the quality of that relationship is defined by the openness of communication. This emphasizes the importance of communication as a leadership skill.

In summary, this section has reviewed the literature on interpersonal attraction and "how attraction may reveal how much one likes the other person and the degree to which one would enjoy working with that person" (Bryne, p. 421). This section explored a few behavioral (amount of physical time, social distance, eye contact, and seating distance) and communication (amount of verbal communication and open communication) characteristics that may reveal the context of interpersonal attraction in relationships. With this background in the existing literature on interpersonal attraction, we can now explore perceived similarity and its influence on interpersonal attraction.

D. INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION AND PERCEIVED SIMILARITY

As previously discussed, interpersonal attraction can be generalized as "how much one likes the other person and the degree to which one would enjoy working with that person" (Bryne, p. 422). We also know that as a rule-of-thumb heuristic, we can observe the behavioral and communication characteristics of individuals to capture a sense of how much they like and enjoy working with one another. Having a clear definition of interpersonal attraction and its characteristics, we can now investigate why attraction occurs between individuals.

1. Perceived Similarity

Perceived similarity is a factor that often explains why interpersonal attraction occurs (Morry, 2007). Perceived similarity is a person's perception that another individual is similar to him, and perceptions are formed when people compare themselves

with others (Morry, 2007). People may use variables such as beliefs, values, behaviors, attitudes, and personality and physical traits (e.g., Klohnen and Luo, 2003) to compare themselves with others; the list of variables is extensive. Whatever the variables may be, research indicates that individuals are attracted to those they perceive to be similar to them (Morry, 2007). Research also indicates that attraction to an individual perceived as similar leads to increased likeability (Bailey and Schreiber, 1981). As Morry (2007) suggests, increased likeability occurs because perceptions of similarity make the individuals in a relationship feel validated, understood, more positive, and less lonely. In other words, being around someone who they perceive as similar completes them in some way. This may be because individuals feel that they share a common bond—i.e., shared variables.

There is evidence that a *perception* of similarity between individuals may influence attraction more than *actual* similarity does (Werner and Parmelee, 1979, p. 62). Morry (2007) and other researchers report that perceptions of similarity, rather than actual similarity, predict the attraction between individuals. Consider the friendship process: generally, individuals only *perceive* that they share similar variables—beliefs, values, behaviors, attitudes, etc. (Morry, 2007). That is, people generally use shallow observations of how others talk, look, act, and dress to conclude that they are similar, when, in fact, such conclusions are premature. Perceptions at the outset may be misleading because first meetings often do not reveal the true individual. Additionally, how individuals talk, look, act, and dress is often influenced by the situational environment in which the interaction takes place. The infamous bar or club scene is an excellent illustration of how a situational environment can result in misleading perceptions of similarity between individuals. Anyone who has met people in this setting can verify that reliable perceptions may not occur until some time after the friendship process begins. In fact, it has been argued that, even after a relationship is formed, "individuals are motivated to perceive similarities to obtain a balance relationship" (Morry, p. 119), even if there is an actual imbalance. Subsequently, as the attraction increases, individuals are self-motivated to create further balance (Morry, 2007), which may be due to the benefits—discussed above—that being similar provides.

With this background on perceived similarity and its role in interpersonal attraction, the next section goes on to describe different forms of perceived similarity that cause interpersonal attraction to occur.

2. Forms of Perceived Similarity

This adage summarizes well the attraction between individuals (Klohnen and Luo, 2003): "Birds of a feather flock together" (p. 711). The sections below discuss three forms of perceive similarity that cause individuals to 'attract' and 'flock together.' These three forms of perceived similarity are attitudinal, behavioral, and physical attractiveness.

a. Attitudinal Similarity

Attitudinal similarity is the perception that one shares similar attitudes with another (Werner and Parmelee, 1979). Lydon, Jamieson and Zanna (1998) state that attitudinal similarity conveys that other individuals share a similar "belief system and set of values" (p. 271). An individual will be attracted to others who are perceived to have similar attitudes (Backman and Secord, 1959) toward such issues as "disciplining of children, monetary policy, family vs. career, immigration, casual sex, divorce, belief in God, social programs, capital punishment, and censorship" (Lydon et al., p. 275). Attitudinal similarity on beliefs and values such as those listed above "is one the primary antecedents to interpersonal attraction" (Lydon et al., p. 271). Specifically, the greater the proportion of similar attitudes held by two people, the greater their attraction to each other (Gonzales, Davis, Loney, LuKens & Junghans, 1983, p. 1192). Lydon et al., (1998) suggest that the following two statements on *disciplining of children* may illustrate differences in beliefs and values, as well as the proportion of attitudinal similarity held by two people: "I am very much against strict disciplining of children," and "I am very much in favor of strict disciplining of children" (p. 275). Hence, when two people both agree strongly with the same statement—whether against or in favor of strict disciplining of children—their proportion of attitudinal similarity is greater than if they opposed each other on this topic (Gonzales et al., 1983; Lydon et al., 1998). Furthermore, the individuals now share a common bond and may position themselves as similar in attitude.

These findings support the explanation in Gonzales et al., (1983) of why employees that want to get ahead adapt to and position themselves as similar to those they work with. Using the U.S. military as an example, the socialization process is designed to turn civilians into military men and women. Essentially, this socialization entails the adoption of U.S. military core values and beliefs, which, for the most part, fosters attitudinal similarity. Those who want to get ahead in this environment more readily adopt the military's values. Specifically, given that there is an integral relationship between attraction and attitudinal similarity, and given that the greater the proportion of similar attitudes, the greater will be the attraction, it follows that individuals who more readily accept the socialization process will more readily attract others as friends. The idea that people often get ahead by attracting friends and building a social network helps explain why some—those who are ambitious and career-minded—may strive more than others to increase their similarity to those in their workplace.

The next section investigates behavioral similarity. Behavioral similarity and attitudinal similarity share an association, but they are not necessarily interdependent.

b. Behavioral Similarity

Behavioral similarity is the perception that one shares similar interests and activities with another (Werner and Parmelee, 1979). Lydon et al., (1998) state that behavioral similarity conveys that another individual "enjoys doing the same sorts of things" (p. 271) and shares similar activity preferences, such as "classical music, exercising, television, camping, drinking, pop music, movies, dancing, and photography" (Lydon et al., p. 275). Similarity with respect to leisure activity preferences may imply a shared set of opportunities for mutually enjoyable interaction (p. 271). Leisure activities provide a purpose and opportunity to interact—a venue for finding out just how similar individuals are to each other. As a result, those deemed highly similar in terms of activity preferences would, perhaps, also be perceived as especially likeable and as possessing especially desirable social traits (Lydon et al., p. 271).

As in the case of attitudinal similarity, one may infer that the greater the proportion of similar behaviors held by two people, the greater their attraction to each

other. Lydon et al., suggest that the following two statements about *classical music* may illustrate differences in interests and activities, as well as the proportion of behavioral similarity held by two people: "I enjoy listening to classical music very much," and "I dislike listening to classical music very much" (p. 275). Hence, as in the above example regarding discipline, if two individuals mutually enjoy or dislike listening to classical music, their proportion of behavioral similarity is greater than if they opposed each other on this topic (Lydon et al., 1998). Individuals may be attracted by behavioral similarity even if they do not share attitudinal similarity. People tend to select "friends who enjoy doing the same sorts of things which they enjoy regardless of attitudinal similarities or dissimilarities" (Werner and Parmelee, p. 62). Consider, for example, one of the most divisive issues of the 2008 presidential race: abortion rights—a woman's right to choose. Now, consider that each Sunday, individuals on both sides of the debate set aside their differences on this issue to worship God under the same roof and to participate in the various other church activities throughout the week. Also, consider that "politicians who debate hotly on the Senate floor all morning are seen golfing together amicably that afternoon" (p. 62). Though these church-goers and politicians may be divided by their beliefs and values, they may enjoy worshipping or playing golf together—activities that may increase their interpersonal attraction, regardless of attitudinal dissimilarities. In short, individuals can overlook bi-partisan attitudes to enjoy activities together. These two examples, though anecdotal, illustrate the importance of behavioral similarity.

The next section investigates physical attractiveness, a trait that is independent of both behavioral and attitudinal similarity.

3. Physical Attractiveness

Physical attractiveness is the perception that one's appearance is appealing to another (Ross and Ferris, 1981). Physical attractiveness and initial attraction are often associated (Huston and Levinger, 1978). As Huston and Levinger (1978) point out, the "physically attractive are judged to be more likeable, friendly, confident, sensitive, and flexible, than the physically unattractive" (p. 619). Individuals want to associate with those who are physically attractive. Physical attractiveness is not a single attribute,

however, and consists of three dimensions: height, weight, and facial attractiveness (Ross and Ferris, 1981). Physical attractiveness is also culture-specific, so, for simplicity, the American perspective on physical attractiveness will be used to discuss height, weight, and facial attractiveness. In the American context, it is generally thought that being short, for men, and being overweight, regardless of gender, are less favorable (Ross and Ferris, 1981). Facial attractiveness is a valued attribute in American culture, and Byrne, London and Reeves (1968) suggest that "both males and females would prefer to be attractive rather than unattractive, to have attractive friends, to marry an attractive spouse, and to produce attractive offspring" (p. 261). Fair or not, vanity prevails in American culture. For this reason, individuals want to perceive themselves as similar to those considered physically attractive because the physically attractive are regarded more favorably than their less physically appealing peers (Huston and Levinger, 1978). Byrne et al., (1968) further suggest that the interpersonal attraction is greater toward an attractive person than toward an unattractive person. Given that the physically attractive are regarded more favorably, it would be warranted to assume they are considered more favorably liked. Hence, as discussed in earlier sections, likeability will further increase the attraction between individuals.

As previously discussed, attitudinal similarity, behavioral similarity, and physical attractiveness may increase "the positive attitude of liking another person" (Feren et al., p. 33), which may then increase interpersonal attraction. Since perceived similarity increases attraction, it is reasonable to assume that a person perceived as similar will receive more favorable outcomes from the individual perceiving the similarity. These favorable outcomes may extend to the workplace. Displaying attitudinal and behavioral similarities with someone—your boss, for example—may lead to more-favorable outcomes in the workplace. If 'birds of a feather flock together,' and if an employee is a member of the boss's 'flock,' then it is reasonable to conclude that this relationship may result in favorable outcomes for the employee. That is to say, interpersonal attractions in the workplace and employee outcomes share an association. The next section will explore this association.

E. INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION AND EMPLOYEE OUTCOMES

Interpersonal attractions in the workplace and employee outcomes share an association. If an employee is a member of the boss's 'flock' or of a particular social circle of employees—that is to say, an employee social 'flock' in the workplace—the employee's interpersonal relationship with the boss or with other employees may influence outcomes in the employee's favor. Likeability and perceived similarity will increase the employee's interpersonal attraction in the workplace and lead to favorable outcomes for the employee. It may be important, especially for managers, to understand this association between interpersonal attraction and employee outcomes because, as leaders, their interpersonal relationship with employees may impact not only employee outcomes, but also the achievement of organizational outcomes. The following sections discuss: 1) the relationship between organizational and employee outcomes; 2) how interpersonal attraction may influence favorable employee outcomes; and 3) more specifically, how attitudinal similarity and social similarity may influence favorable employee outcomes.

1. Organizational and Employee Outcomes

Organizational and employee outcomes have an interdependent relationship that may impact the effectiveness of organizations. First, consider some basic accepted truths about organizations: A successful organization will achieve its goals and have effective outcomes, and effective employee outcomes are required to have effective organizational outcomes. Second, consider that research indicates that the effectiveness of organizations "is likely to be enhanced when employees go above and beyond the call of duty to aid fellow workers and achieve organizational goals" (Chattopadhyay, 1999, p. 273). That is, when employees work together with enhanced cohesiveness, they are more effective at achieving organizational outcomes. Given what we know about interpersonal attraction, we may now suggest that an employee is more likely to go above and beyond the call of duty to aid another person when his or her attitude towards that person is positive (Feren et al., 1988). The likeability of an employee may result in other employees' attitudes towards him or her being more positive, which enhances employee cohesiveness, which,

in turn, enhances organizational cohesiveness. As in the 'Gung Ho' example, organizational cohesiveness will enhance an organization's effectiveness in achieving its outcomes. Lastly, given what we know about perceived similarity, we may suggest that an employee is more likely to go above and beyond the call of duty to aid another person if he or she *perceives* that they share similar beliefs, values, behaviors, attitudes, etc. (Morry, 2007).

Thus, it is a warranted assumption that likeability and perceived similarity may increase the employee's interpersonal attraction in the workplace and influence outcomes that are favorable to both the employee and the organization. The next section will discuss the relationship between interpersonal attraction and favorable employee outcomes.

2. Interpersonal Attraction and Favorable Employee Outcomes

Likeability and perceived similarity may increase the employee's interpersonal attraction in the workplace and, thus, result in favorable outcomes for the employee. First, consider some basic accepted beliefs about employees: 1) Those who go above and beyond the call of duty will be recognized by the organization for their efforts; 2) employee work efforts (of this sort) will reap favorable employee outcomes; and 3) employees who reap favorable outcomes will have a positive effect in the workplace. Second, research suggests that employees who have a positive effect in the workplace will be viewed by other employees as more deserving of 1) increased job support to accomplish organizational goals and 2) employee incentives (Staw, Sutton & Pelled, 1994). That is to say, an employee who has a positive effect in the workplace is more likely to receive job support from other employees above and beyond the call of duty because their attitude towards the employee is positive. This increased job support from co-workers may enable the employee to further increase his or her effectiveness at achieving employee outcomes. In addition, employees who have a positive effect in the workplace are considered more deserving of employee incentives. In these cases, it is possible that other employees perceive themselves as equally hard workers and are pleased to see that the organization is rewarding hard work. Consider the U.S. Navy, for

example. In the U.S. Navy, service member incentives for hard work normally come in the form of commendation medals or formal recognition ceremonies before one's peers and subordinates. In the U.S. Navy, increased job support normally means that one will more readily receive support from other service members to accomplish one's goals, which, in many cases, are the organization's goals. In other words, with increased job support, service members will be less likely to encounter organizational resistance or "push back" from other service members, which may enable them to be more effective in the organization. Arguably, this implies that such service members are well admired and respected and that others may emulate their work ethic to gain similar admiration or respect.

With this in mind, we now suggest that an employee's interpersonal attraction to his or her manager may influence favorable employee outcomes. For instance, employees may adopt the behavior and attitudes of others who are admired and respected in the workplace in order to gain similar admiration or respect. They may consider this a way to convince other employees that they are more deserving of 1) increased job support to accomplish organizational goals and 2) employee incentives (Staw, Sutton & Pelled, 1994). Or, in other words, this may be a way to receive more favorable employee outcomes. These employees may also consider increasing their interpersonal attraction with their managers since employee incentives normally flow from managers, and managers often recognize favorable employee outcomes when selecting employees for promotion. Hence, the role of the manager in the workplace may explain why ambitious and career-minded employees may strive more than others to increase their similarity to their boss. There is evidence to suggest that an employee's interpersonal attraction to his or her manager will influence employee outcomes such as job satisfaction and the formation of organizational networks (Feren et al., 1988) in the workplace. In particular, Feren et al., (1988) list attitudinal similarity as one of the factors that cause interpersonal attraction to one's manager. Ross and Ferris (1981) also conducted research on interpersonal attraction and its relationship to outcomes in the workplace. In particular, they list attitudinal similarity and social similarity among the factors that cause interpersonal attraction to one's manager.

Perceived similarity may increase the employee's interpersonal attraction to his or her manager and influence employee outcomes. The sections below discuss the two types of perceived similarity—attitudinal and social similarity—that have been found to specifically affect employee outcomes.

a. Attitudinal Similarity

Attitudinal similarity may impact employee outcomes such as hiring decisions, and performance evaluations. For example, Ross and Ferris (1981) cite two studies—one of which was conducted by Basket (1973)—that link attitudinal similarity to employers' hire/no hire decisions. Basket (1973) investigated how employee competency and attitudinal similarity influenced employer hiring decisions by using "fifty-one subjects [who] were asked to assume that they worked for a large company and that the president had asked them to evaluate a candidate for a position as a vice president" (p. 343). The study suggests that an employer will evaluate an applicant who shares his or her attitudes more favorably than one who does not, and that the applicant deemed more like the employer in attitude is more likely to be hired. In short, this study suggests that even before an individual is even allowed to become an employee, the subjective criterion of attitudinal similarity influences managers' hiring decisions (Basket, 1973).

Byrne (1971) and Gonzales et al., (1983) suggest that attitudinal similarity influences personal evaluations of others and that assumptions are based on perceptions of attitudinal similarity. This relationship suggests that an employee evaluation could be more subjective than objective and that important hiring decisions could end up being influenced more by attitudinal similarity than by employee performance. The U.S. military's evaluation process for its enlisted personnel illustrates this phenomenon. The evaluation process is normally conducted by a senior enlisted member who, over time, has formed a hardened attitude and an opinion of how military members should act and think. The evaluation form lists criteria for both objective evaluation (performance) and subjective evaluation (attitude and esprit de corps). Consequently, the subjective evaluation of military members is an integral part of the process and is a popular subject

of debate. Some people question the value of subjectivity, especially when the evaluation score often changes as it moves through the chain of command. It may be that evaluators' perceptions of military members' attitudes are impacted by how similar or dissimilar these attitudes are to the evaluator's.

b. Social Similarity

Social similarity may also impact employee outcomes, such hiring decisions and employee evaluations. Social similarity can be described as individual attempts to match or best another in social attributes pertaining to status, acceptance, admiration, and recognition. In the workplace, social similarity is more commonly associated with economic status, organizational position, and educational background (Ross and Ferris, 1981). Ross and Ferris (1981) cite studies—one of which was conducted by Salancik and Pfeffer (1978)—that link social similarity to employers' hire/no hire decisions, as well to organizational decisions such as employee evaluations and promotion. Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) suggest that decision makers—specifically, employers who make hiring decisions—will see "themselves as successful in a given social role, [and] would naturally tend to believe that their own characteristics helped in that success" (p. 247). They further suggest that social similarity will provide a "familiar and comfortable frame of reference for making . . . evaluations" (p. 247). The employers will, therefore, hire an employee with social similarities to themselves (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). In addition to influencing hiring and evaluation, social similarity in the workplace may increase social interaction and acceptance between individuals, which may lead them to like each other more and to develop a 'social bond' (Baker, 1983).

Interpersonal attraction due to social similarity may have the strongest influence on employee outcomes. Baker (1983) suggests that if the situation allows, people will choose to associate with those with whom they are socially similar. Individuals chosen as associates may reflect the 'right' social attributes to be perceived as socially similar. Hence, an individual reflecting the 'right' social attributes may be admitted into the 'right' social circle, or what Baker (1983) refers to as the "field of eligibles" (p. 268). The "field of eligibles" is a selection of individuals who have been

vetted for inclusion on the grounds of being socially similar to the individual doing the vetting. Thus, this suggests that social similarity may be used as a subjective criterion to narrow the field of employees eligible for promotion. Feren et al., (1988) and Ross and Ferris (1981) shed light on how objective criteria (performance) and subjective criteria (perceived similarity) sometimes become indistinguishable as evaluation criteria that managers use to make decisions that impact employee outcomes. First, consider social similarity. For example, fair or unfair, employers have been known to hire and promote employees who attended their own alma mater. As a more illustrative example, consider our current Republican presidential candidate, John S. McCain III, who retired as a Captain in the United States Navy. McCain is the son and grandson of two previous four-star admirals in the United States Navy. Arguably, if McCain had not retired as a Captain, he very likely would have succeeded his father and grandfather as a four-star admiral in the United States Navy. Above all, McCain may be perceived as 'cut from the same jib' as his father and grandfather. Thus, had McCain continued his Naval career, his superiors and contemporaries may have perceived him as an individual reflecting the 'right' social attributes for promotion because of his "pedigree."

F. CONCLUSION

A review of the literature on interpersonal attraction was conducted to investigate the impact on employee outcomes. Attractions are the basis on which individuals decide to enter relationships, which, in the workplace, are often formal and involuntary (Klohnen and Luo, 2003; Orbuch and Sprecher, 2003). These workplace attractions may reveal the degree to which individuals like working with each other and the extent to which they like others. Indications of attraction may be observed through behavioral and communication characteristics of an interpersonal relationship. These behavioral characteristics (amount of physical time spent together, social distance, eye contact, and seating distance) and communication characteristics (amount and degree of openness of communication) may reveal the polarity and strength of interpersonal attraction in relationships. In addition, the literature seems to support the notion that interpersonal attraction and perceived similarity share an association. Furthermore, perceived similarity

is a factor that often explains why interpersonal attraction occurs in the workplace, and it may impact employee outcomes (Morry, 2007). These findings are important for numerous reasons. First, it is beneficial for leaders to understand how attraction occurs in the workplace because they are expected to ensure positive workplace relationships (manager-to-employee, manager-to-manager, and employee-to-manager) in the organization. Second, the leader should understand how they may increase employees' attraction towards them: The more an employee likes a leader, the more the attraction between the two will increase. Third, these findings shed light on how objective criteria (performance) and subjective criteria (perceived similarity) sometimes become indistinguishable as evaluation criteria that managers use to make decisions impacting employee outcomes. Lastly, these findings may aid military leaders in further understanding how interpersonal attraction in relationships might impact organizational outcomes.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IV. CONCLUSION

A. KEY POINTS ON POWER

A review of the communication and management literature on power and employee perceptions of leadership was conducted to determine how various uses of power and forms of the five power bases impact employee perceptions of leaders and leadership communication. Four key points emerged from this literature review. First, power and leadership communication share an association that is evident in the communication transactions between leaders and employees. Leadership is a process in which a leader uses power to influence people through communication transactions: a two-way process that involves transactional speaking and listening between the leader and employee (Baldoni, 2004; Penley and Hawkins, 1985). Communication transactions occur during various interpersonal interactions with employees, including 1) performance appraisals, 2) coaching seminars, 3) information-sharing workshops, and 4) award ceremonies.

Second, communication transactions have message content and relational rapport characteristics that may reveal the effectiveness of subsequent leadership communication between the leader and the employee. Communication content corresponds to "what is being said," while communication relational rapport characteristics correspond to "how it is said." These two aspects of communication, together, reveal the nature of cooperation within the leader and employee relationship (Penley and Hawkins, 1985), which may, in turn, reveal the strength of the leader's influence within the relationship. Also, within this interpersonal relationship, the leader's communication approach will reveal the characteristics (type and magnitude) of the power bases he possesses.

Third, a leader's use of the five power bases (legitimate, reward, expert, referent and coercive) may contribute to positive and negative employee perceptions of leadership. Perceptions of leadership are shaped by two factors: the leader's communication approach and the power bases he uses to influence the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal accomplishment (Barge et al., 1989). The

literature suggests that managers "derive their coercive, reward, and legitimate power bases from the positions they hold, but they derive their expert and referent power bases from their own training, experience and personal qualities" (Rahim et al., 1994, p. 137). Hence, expert and referent power are classified as personal power bases and the others as position power bases. Moreover, expert and referent power will have a greater influence than the other power bases on the activities of an individual or a group because, in part, they can lead to admiration and emulation, regardless of the leader's job title or level within the organization (Fedor et al., 2001; Katz 1998).

The fourth key point is that a leader should be aware that employee perceptions are associated with employee outcomes in the workplace—specifically, self-esteem, commitment, and job satisfaction—that may influence organizational outcomes, such as productivity. For instance, perceptions on how a leader uses his or her five power bases can impact job satisfaction in the organization (Rahim and Afza, 1993; Rahim et al., 1994; and Robie et al., 1998). Rahim and Afza (1993), Rahim et al., (1994), and Robie et al., (1998) studied job satisfaction and concluded that, moreover, expert and referent power bases have a positive relationship with job satisfaction and that the coercive power base has a negative relationship with job satisfaction. This is a crucial finding because employee job satisfaction shares a relationship with commitment, job level and the propensity to leave a job (Robie et al., 1998).

In short, these findings suggest that a leader should develop a greater understanding of how power and employee perceptions of leadership communication influence employee and organizational outcomes.

B. KEY POINTS ON INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION

A review of the literature on interpersonal attraction was conducted to investigate its impact on employee outcomes. Six key points emerged from this literature review. First, attractions are the basis from which individuals decide to enter relationships. In the workplace, these relationships are often formal and involuntary. Attraction in the workplace is often characterized as "how much one likes the other person and the degree

to which one would enjoy working with that person" (Bryne, 1997, p. 421). Relationships in the workplace are usually 'working friendships.' For 'working friendships' to occur, individuals must interact and then be aware that they share an attraction.

Second, attractions in the workplace may reveal the degree to which individuals like working with each other and the extent to which they like others. Generally speaking, attraction in the workplace is "the positive attitude of liking another person" (Feren et al., p. 33). If the interpersonal attraction is mutual and receptive, a positive attitude will result, which will foster mutual liking, loving, and respect (Backman, 1981). Positive attitudes will reinforce a positive interpersonal attraction, which, thus, increases the strength of the interpersonal attraction. In the workplace, an increasing strength of interpersonal attractions will create stronger workplace relations (leader-to-employee, leader-to-leader, and employee-to-employee).

Third, indications of attraction may be observed through the behavioral and communication characteristics of an interpersonal relationship. These behavioral characteristics (amount of physical time spent together, social distance, eye contact, and seating distance) and communication characteristics (amount and degree of openness of communication) may reveal the polarity and strength of interpersonal attraction in relationships. These characteristics, though subjective, may provide a simple rule-of-thumb heuristic to evaluate interpersonal relationships.

Fourth, interpersonal attraction and perceived similarity share an association. Perceived similarity is a factor that often explains why interpersonal attraction occurs and, in the workplace, it may impact employee outcomes such as employee evaluations, promotion, and hiring decisions. Perceived similarity is a person's perception that another individual is similar to him or her. Perceptions are formed when people compare themselves with others (Morry, 2007) using variables such as beliefs, values, behaviors, attitudes, and personality and physical traits (e.g., Klohnen and Luo, 2003) to perceive similarity; the list of variables is extensive. Whatever the variables may be, research indicates that individuals are attracted to those they perceive to be similar to them (Morry, 2007).

Fifth, leaders should understand how attraction occurs in the workplace because they are expected to ensure positive, harmonious workplace relationships (manager-to-employee, manager-to-manager, and employee-to-manager) in the organization. Positive, harmonious relationships will benefit the organization. Cote (1999) suggests that "in general, happier employees are more productive, and also that more productive employees are happier" (p. 68). Pfeffer (2005) refers to studies that suggest "that the most productive employees were about twice as good as the least productive" (p. 97).

The sixth key point is that leaders should understand how they may increase the attraction of employees towards them. An increased interpersonal attraction will cause employees to like their leader more, which will then increase the attraction between the two. The more a leader is liked, the more positive are the employee's attitudes towards him or her, which enhances organizational cohesiveness. The relational benefit of organizational cohesiveness translates into happier employees that are more productive and increased work output.

In short, these findings suggest that a leader should develop a greater understanding of how interpersonal attraction and perceived similarity in relationships might impact employee and organizational outcomes.

C. IMPLICATIONS FOR LEADERS' COMMUNICATION

First, the role of communication in command leadership is an important one that offers both opportunities and challenges in cultivating an organizational culture that enhances employee performance, motivation, and satisfaction. If command leaders have a better understanding of how communication behaviors affect employee outcomes, they can potentially be more effective in improving employee retention, increasing command readiness, and managing organizational change. Much of the existing literature on the relationship between leader effectiveness and various communication behaviors is based on the private sector. Nonetheless, this literature is valuable and can offer many insights that are relevant to Navy leaders. The private-sector research offers new perspectives on how to improve communicative and organizational awareness in command leadership; having a good understand of leadership communication and its implications is crucial to

Navy commanders who want to improve sailor performance, motivation, and satisfaction to achieve command and mission objectives. In addition, insights into leadership communication will help Navy commanders take advantage of the relationship between communication and leader effectiveness. Management literature on public sector organizations suggests that managers have created organizational opportunities that increase revenues, reduce process inefficiencies, and maximize returns on investment (ROI) (Nutt and Backoff, 1993). This understanding of the role of management is fairly widespread. However, leadership is a process that is less understood, and there is not heuristic to be a good leader. Thus, the literature review in this thesis may provide a foundation for future research to develop a communication heuristic for Naval leadership to help improve organizational performance and sailor motivation and satisfaction.

Second, if command leaders have a better understanding of how communication behaviors affect employee outcomes, they may be inclined to conduct a self-assessment of their communication strengths and weakness in order to become more effective communicators. For command leaders, leadership communication is a skill that is crucial to spearheading organizational change and mission accomplishment. Command leaders are expected to communicate effectively because they have the responsibility of influencing their sailors "to be energetic and skillful in the pursuit of organizational objectives" (Tjosvold et al., 1992, p. 39). Command leaders are expected to communicate effectively also because leadership communication is the bridge that transmits the commander's intent to his or her sailors, thus creating a foundation of understanding and trust (Mayfield and Mayfield). This is the foundation for building cooperative shipboard relationships, which may be positively associated with command retention and organizational loyalty. Additionally, in order to build understanding, trust and loyalty in an organization, a command leader must be aware that his or her communication will be evaluated by both its content—"what is being said"—and communication relational rapport characteristics—"how it is said." These two aspects of communication, together, may impact the cooperation that the command leader receives from his or her sailors (Penley and Hawkins, 1985).

Lastly, the quality of a commander's communication will influence how sailors perceive their command leadership and the pride sailors have in their command. A sailor who is proud of his command leadership and command will likely go above and beyond to ensure mission accomplishment. Sailors are the lifeblood and the heart of the command, and only through them are naval missions accomplished. It is, therefore, crucial that the command leader foster understanding, trust, and loyalty among his sailors so that they may follow faithfully to accomplish naval missions. The U.S. Navy has three core values that are instilled in every sailor who takes the oath of naval service: honor, courage, and commitment to help foster sailor understanding, trust and loyalty with their command leader. The command leader is the steward of these Navy core values and is charged to ensure that every sailor under his or her command adheres to them when carrying out naval duties. Moreover, the Navy core values are the foundation on which command leaders base their command mission statement and commander's intent. The role of communication in command leadership is to convey these core values in their command mission statement and commander's intent in order to cultivate sailors who are not only motivated and satisfied with their leadership, but are also ready to meet the Naval challenges of the 21st century.

D. RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

There are some limitations of this research. First of all, this literature review was based on studies conducted in the private sector; therefore, some principles and conclusions may not be applicable to the public sector, simply due to the nature of how business is conducted in the U.S. Navy. For example, the discussion of interpersonal attraction in the workplace suggests that likeability will foster stronger superior-subordinate and peer-to-peer relationships. However, in some environments, ensuring likability may have unintended consequences. In the Navy, for example, such familiarity may lead to a breakdown in the military chain of command. Thus, the way the private sector views and applies power, interpersonal attraction, and perceived similarity may not be completely applicable to a U.S. Navy command environment—especially during wartime.

Second, by narrowing my research focus to very specific communication concepts—power, interpersonal attraction, and perceived similarity—I have, by necessity, limited my discussion. While I focused on such important outcomes as how leaders may potentially be more effective in improving employee retention, increasing command readiness, and managing organizational change, there are many other communication concepts to explore that may be equally as important to achieving these outcomes. For example, some of the additional factors to consider might include communication style, leader style, communicative competence, and leader-employee immediacy. In addition, my research did not examine which of the communicative concepts—power, interpersonal attraction, or perceived similarity—has the greatest impact on employee and organizational outcomes. Consequently, I cannot firmly recommend which communicative concept would likely have the greatest impact on sailor and command outcomes in the U.S. Navy. Lastly, this research did not evaluate how variables such as sex, age and race play a role in power, interpersonal attraction, and perceived similarity.

E. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

I recommend that future research consider how demographics such as sex, age, and race play a role in how power is gained and used. Moreover, it would be interesting to see how sex, age, and race affect interpersonal attraction and perceived similarity. I am confident that if these variables are added to the research problem, the impact seen on employee outcomes might be different. In addition, it would be interesting to investigate how leaders take these variables into account in their day-to-day work activities. For example: Do leaders consciously consider these variables when making leadership decisions? Do these variables play a role in superior-subordinate and peer-to-peer relationships? Are individuals who share perceived similarities relating to sex, age, and race aware of the impact that these perceptions have on their communication, which then impacts leadership effectiveness?

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF REFERENCES

Adler, S. (1983). Subordinate imitation of supervisor behavior: The role of supervisor power and subordinate self-esteem. *Social Behavior and Personality, 11*(2), 5-10.

Backman, C. (1981). *Attraction in interpersonal relationships.* New Brunswick, NJ, US: Transaction Publishers.

Backman, C. W., & Secord, P. F. (1959). The effect of perceived liking on interpersonal attraction. *Human Relations, 12*(4), 379-384.

Bailey, R. C., & Schreiber, T. S. (1981). Congruency of physical attractiveness perceptions and liking. *Journal of Social Psychology, 115*(2), 285.

Baker, P. M. (1983). The friendship process: A developmental model of interpersonal attraction. *Sociological Spectrum, 3*(3), 265-279.

Baldoni, J. (2004). Powerful leadership communication. *Leader to Leader, 32,* 20-24.

Barge, J. K., Downs, C. W., & Johnson, K. M. (1989). An analysis of effective and ineffective leader conversation. *Management Communication Quarterly, 2*(3), 357-386.

Baskett, G. D. (1973). Interview decisions as determined by competency and attitude similarity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 57*(3), 343-345.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York: Free Press.

Bohn, J. G. (2002). The relationship of perceived leadership behaviors to organizational efficacy. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 9*(2), 65-79.

Bradac, J. J., Street, R. L., & Jr. (1989). Powerful and powerless styles of talk: A theoretical analysis of language and impression formation. *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 23,* 195-241.

Byrne, D. (1997). An overview (and underview) of research and theory within the attraction paradigm. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 14*(3), 417-431.

Byrne, D. E. (1971). *The Attraction Paradigm,* New York: Academic Press.

Byrne, D., & Griffitt, W. (1973). Interpersonal attraction. *Annual Review of Psychology, 24*(1), 317.

Byrne, D., London, O., & Reeves, K. (1968). The effects of physical attractiveness, sex, and attitude similarity on interpersonal attraction. Journal of Personality, *36*(2), 259.

Campbell, K. S., White, C. D., & Johnson, D. E. (2003). Leader-member relations as a function of rapport management. *The Journal of Business Communication, 40*(3), 170-194.

Chattopadhyay, P. (1999). Beyond direct and symmetrical effects: The influence of demographic dissimilarity on organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*(3), 273-287.

Côté, S. (1999). Affect and performance in organizational settings. Current Directions in Psychological Science, *8*(2), 65-68.

Dunbar, Norah E. (2004). Theory in Progress: Dyadic Power Theory: Constructing a Communication-Based Theory of Relational Power. *Journal of Family Communication, 4*(3), 235-248.

Dunbar, N. E., & Burgoon, J. K. (2005). Perceptions of power and interactional dominance in interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*(2), 207-233.

Elangovan, A. R., & Xie, J. L. (1999). Effects of perceived power of supervisor on subordinate stress and motivation: The moderating role of subordinate characteristics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*(3), 359-373.

Eriksen, E. O. (2001). Leadership in a communicative perspective. *Acta Sociologica, 44*(1), 21-35.

Fedor, D. B., Davis, W. D., Maslyn, J. M., & Mathieson, K. (2001). Performance improvement efforts in response to negative feedback: The roles of source power and recipient self-esteem. Journal of Management, *27*(1), 79-97.

Feren, D. B., Carroll, S. J., & Olian, J. D. (1988). Effects of managerial performance and attitudinal similarity on interpersonal attraction. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 9*(1), 33-44.

French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). *The bases of social power*. Oxford, England: Univer. Michigan.

Gioia, D. A., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1983). Perceptions of managerial power as a consequence of managerial behavior and reputation. *Journal of Management, 9*(1), 7-26.

Greenbaum, H. H., Holden, E. J.,Jr, & Spataro, L. (1983). Organizational structure and communication processes: A study of change. *Group & Organization Studies (Pre-1986), 8*(1), 61-82.

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Natemeyer, W. E. (1979). Situational leadership, perception, and the impact of power. *Group & Organization Management, 4*(4), 418-428.

Hirokawa, R. Y., & And Others. (1990). Impact of managerial power on persuasive strategy selection by female and male managers. *Management Communication Quarterly, 4*(1), 30-50.

Hope Gonzales, M., Davis, J. M., Loney, G. L., Lukens, C. K., & Junghans, C. M. (1983). Interactional approach to interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 44*(6), 1192-1197.

Huston, T. L., & Levinger, G. (1978). Interpersonal attraction and relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology, 29*, 115-156.

Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and social organization: A study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. *American Sociological Review, 33*(4), 499-517.

Katz, S. M. (1998). A newcomer gains power: An analysis of the role of rhetorical expertise. *Journal of Business Communication, 35*(4), 419-442.

Klohnen, E. C., & Luo, S. (2003). Interpersonal attraction and personality: What is attractive--self similarity, ideal similarity, complementarity, or attachment security? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *85*(4), 709-722.

Komter, A. (1989). Hidden Power In Marriage. *Gender & Society, 3*(2), 187-216.

Lawrence, T. B., & Robinson, S. L. (2007). Ain't misbehavin: Workplace deviance as organizational resistance. *Journal of Management, 33*(3), 378-394.

Lydon, J., Jamieson, D., Zanna, M. (1988). Interpersonal similarity and the social and intellectual dimensions of first impressions. *Social Cognition, 6*(4), 269.

Mayfield, J., & Mayfield, M. (2002). Leader communication strategies critical paths to improving employee commitment. American Business Review, *20*(2), 89-94.

McCallister, L. (1983). Predicted employee compliance to downward communication styles. *Journal of Business Communication, 20*(1), 67-79.

McCroskey, J. C., & McCain, T. A. (1972). The measurement of interpersonal attraction., Report: ED071140. 11p.

Montgomery, B. M. Interpersonal attraction as a function of open communication and gender. *Communication Research Reports, 3*(1), 140-145.

Morry, M. (2007). The attraction--similarity hypothesis among cross-sex friends: Relationship satisfaction, perceived similarities, and self-serving perceptions. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, *24*(1), 117-138.

Mossholder, K. W., Bennett, N., Kemery, E. R., & Wesolowski, M. A. (1998). Relationships between bases of power and work reactions: The mediational role of procedural justice. Journal of Management, *24*(4), 533-552.

Nutt, P. C., & Backoff, R. W. (1993). Transforming public organizations with strategic management and strategic leadership. *Journal of Management, 19*(2), 299-347.

Orbuch, T. L., & Sprecher, S. (2003). Attraction and interpersonal relationships. (pp. 339-362) Springer Science & Business Media B.V. / Books.

Penley, L. E., & Hawkins, B. (1985). Studying interpersonal communication in organizations: A leadership application. *Academy of Management Journal, 28*(2), 309-326.

Pfeffer, J. (2005). Producing sustainable competitive advantage through the effective management of people. *The Academy of Management Executive, 19*(4), 95.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey. (1981) *Power in organizations*. Marshfield, Mass.: Pitman Pub.

Rahim, M. A. (1989). Relationships of leader power to compliance and satisfaction with supervision: Evidence from a national sample of managers. *Journal of Management, 15*(4), 545-556.

Rahim, M. A., & Afza, M. (1993). Leader power, commitment, satisfaction, compliance, and propensity to leave a job among U.S. accountants. *Journal of Social Psychology, 133*(5), 611-625.

Rahim, M. A., Kim, N. H., & Kim, J. S. (1994). Bases of leader power, subordinate compliance, and satisfaction with supervision: A cross-cultural study of managers in the U.S. and S. Korea. International Journal of Organizational Analysis, *2*(2), 136-154.

Robie, C., Ryan, A. M., Schmieder, R. A., Parra, L. F., & Smith, P. C. (1998). The relation between job level and job satisfaction. *Group & Organization Management, 23*(4), 470-495.

Rollins, B. C., & Bahr, S. J. (1976). A theory of power of relationships. *Journal of Marriage & Family, 38*(4), 619-627.

Ross, J., & Ferris, K. R. (1981). Interpersonal attraction and organizational outcomes: A field examination. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *26*(4), 617-632.

Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). Uncertainty, secrecy, and the choice of similar others. Social Psychology, *41*(3), 246-255.

Scherwitz, L., & Helmreich, R. (1973). Interactive effects of eye contact and verbal content on interpersonal attraction in dyads. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25*(1), 6-14.

Sharma, V., & Kaur, I. (1996). Interpersonal attraction in relation to the loss-gain hypothesis. Journal of Social Psychology, *136*(5), 635-638.

Staw, B. M., Sutton, R. I., & Pelled, L. H. (1994). Employee positive emotion and favorable outcomes at the workplace. *Organization Science, 5*(1), 51-71.

Thomas, C., & Thomas, B. (2004). Charisma and Charismatic Tendencies in Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Leadership Style. *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology*, *32*(2), 163.

Tjosvold, D. (1989). Interdependence and power between managers and employees: A study of the leader relationship. Journal of Management, *15*(1), 49-62.

Tjosvold, D., Andrews, I. R., & Struthers, J. T. (1992). Leadership influence: Goal interdependence and power. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 132*(1), 39-50.

Werner, C., & Latané, B. (1976). Responsiveness and communication medium in dyadic interactions. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, *8*(1), 13-15.

Werner, C., & Parmelee, P. (1979). Similarity of activity preferences among friends: Those who play together stay together. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 42*(1), 62-66.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
   Ft. Belvoir, Virginia

2. Dudley Knox Library
   Naval Postgraduate School
   Monterey, California